ETHNOLOGY OF ANCIENT BHĀRATA

BY

RAM CHANDRA JAIN

Director,

Institute of Bhāratalogical Research,

Sriganganagar (Rajasthan State)

THE

CHOWKHAMBA SANSKRIT SERIES OFFICE

VARANASI-1 (India)

1970

DEDICATED

TO

THE SRAMAṆIC AND THE BRAHMIC ṚṢIS

WHO GAVE US

THE ṚGVEDA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER VI : THE PRĀCHYA IKṢVĀKUS.

CHAPTER VII : THE BRAHMA ETHNOLOGY

CHAPTER VIII : TWO EARLIEST MIXED TRIBES

CHAPTER IX : THE ORIGIN OF VARṆIC ETHNOLOGY

CHAPTER X : THE DRAVIḌAS

PREFACE

The whole universe, the unknown and the known, moves in an ordered progress. The whole Nature, the living and the anti-living, moves in a dialectical orderliness. The whole world, the human and the physical, moves in accordance with the inherent laws of nature. The human society, yet known since C. 4000 B. C., has also moved in accordance with the laws of dialectical society. The interpretations at the historical existence of the human society, so far, have failed to present the ture historical reality as they have not been made in accordance with the real laws of nature and society.

Before the advent of the age of Science, the history of the human society and its components was a futile exercise in feudal eulogies. The laws of the newly discovered natural sciences reacted in the sociological sphere and resulted in the origin and advancement of the scientific outlook. They exercised a healthy influence on the literary field and the social scientists, like their compatriots, the natural scientists, developed a realist perspective, though within the limits set by the limitations of science. The result was the emergence of the science of Orientalism with a historical and critical method. Its limitation was the then ruling universal scientific belief, under the magic influence of the great Darwin, that the man and the human society have advanced from primitivity to civility.

But this state of knowledge was negatived by the fresher and fuller discoveries in the fields of archaeology, linguistics, anthoropology, geography, geology and the allied sciences and the truth became revealed that civility had also preceded the primitivity and thus arose the dilemma, from primitivity to civility or from civility to primitivity or what?

The origin and growth of the Āryan problem in the eighteenth century A. D. further aggravated the elusiveness of this dilemma and the starkness of this challenge. No serious

scholar today denies the existence of the Āryan problem. Almost all the orientalists agree that the Āryan political hegemony over the world became supreme by the beginning of the first millenium B. C. The military and the political conquest of the semi-barbarian Āryan hordes of history was an epochal one. It substituted one set of values by an other set. The archeologists of India, Iraq, Egypt and Greece are unanimous on the point that the Āryans completely annihilated a culture and civilization far superior, far advanced and far humane than their own. These materialists of the mountains subjugated the spiritualists of the plains. This was an epochal universal phenomena from Greece to Bhārata.

If we concede that the Āryanism forced its mastery over the pre-Āryanism which I call Śramanism, then we have to further advance our scientific attitude. The reality emerges in quite a new form. There had been certain parts of the world where the human society advanced from primitivity to civility In other parts, it denigrated from civility to primitivity. The Āryan world represented the former and the Śramanic World the latter. The political supremacy of the former over the latter resulted in cultural coalescences, the dialectical developments of which have brought into existence the human society as we find it today. The advent of Āryanism marks the end of an outgoing epoch and the beginning of a new one. If we re-interpret the historical existence of the human society and its constituents within defined and undefined national boundaries through this newly emerged reality, we would be nearer truth. For the discovery of this truth, the historical and critical method has become obsolete. We have to re-interpret the history of the culture and civilization of the human society from the dialectical, chronological and historical perspective with the organic critical method. I have fully discussed this new perspective and this new method in my research work, "The Most Ancient Āryan Society."

We today need the re-interpretation of the history of the culture and the civilization of the human society as a whole as well as of its national constituents. Bhārata had been, is

and shall be the epi-centre of the culture and civilization of the human society. We, hence, need this re-interpretation of the Bhāratīya culture and civilization first and most. We have founded the Institute of Bhāratalogical research for this epochal purpose and the published and to-be-published research works of the Institute have been designed, planned and executed in the light of this new science of Bhāratalogy.

The groups of people who made, unmade and remade the Bhāratīya cultural patterns at various determining periods of its history need our first attention. The present research work is an attempt to meet this cultural challenge. The Āryan intruders in Bhārata may, for exactness, be epitheted as the Brahmāryans. The foreign Brahmāryan military conquest of Bhārata was complete C. 1000 B. C. The new masters of Bhārata, under local pressures, were forced to coalesce with the vanquished original masters of Bhārata. This coalesced cultural pattern first emerged as the Brahmaṇa which, in due course of time, developed into the Brāhmana. The Brāhmaṇa ethnological group, thus, comes out as a coalesced creation of the foreign Brahmāryans and the original Bhāratiyans. If we keep in view this historical reality, much many problems of Bhārata would get automatic solutions. Whatever content in the Bhāratiya culture is materialistic, that is a foreign import. Whatever is spiritual in it, that is its original possession. It is original possession that accounts for the much appreciated, and much advertised too ', ages-long cultural continuum of the Bhāratiya heritage.

The ancient Brāhmaṇa literature is a confluence of two mutually opposite cultural streams. The authors who were śramanic converts to the Brahma society eulogised spiritualism and deprecated materialism. The case was quite reverse with the original Brahma authors. These two streams are clearly visible in the Vedas, the Brāhmaṇas and the Upaniṣads. The original ethnic groups, in this literature, are deprecated by the Brahma composers while the convert composers eulogise these ethnic groups. These two clear streams very rightly help us in determining the real origin of these ethnic groups.

The ethnic groups of the Pūrus, the Yadus, the Turvaśas, the Anus and the Druhyus, so far declared to be belonging to the Āryan-blood, clearly come out as the non-Āryan pre-Āryan ethnic groups. So is the case with the Ikṣvākus. The emergence of this historical reality would solve several historical problems arising between beginning of the first millenium B. C and the first half of the first millenium A. D. of the Bhāratīya history. The annihilation of the Nāga political power by the Guptas may alone be understood rightly with this historical perspective. This revelation also throws fresh light on the diluted republican institutions of the Mahāvīra and the Buddha era.

If we like to discover one fundamental cause of the continuing degradation of the Bhāratīya culture and civilization, the existence of the Varnic system is that one basic cause. It is, hence, of utmost importance to the Bhāratīya historian to rightly understand the origin and growth of the Varṇic system. This work presents quite a new approach to the problem. The Varnic ethnological groups played the most important historical roles in Bhārata and historian perversely understanding this problem would never find the reality of Bhāratīya culture and civilization.

The Dravidian problem, like the Āryan one, is another most vexing problem of the Bhāratīya heritage. The scholars, so far, unanimously hold that the Dravidian ethnic groups preceded the Āryan ones. The one-sided historical and critical method is responsible for this mistake. The Mediterraneans, identified with the Dravidians, came to Bhārata in two waves. We are indebted to the recent archaeological and anthropological researches for getting this truth. The first wave came from the Mediterranean regions, through the west Asian land routes, to Bhārata in the first quarter of the third millenium B. C. and indistinguishably got amalgamated with the pre-existing proto-Australoid ethnic stocks. They developed into the famous Ahi and the Ahi-Ikṣvāku stocks. The famous Pañchajanāḥ of the Bhāratīya history owe much to this ethnic immigration. The second Mediterranean wave came in the

first quarter of the first millenium B. C. They are the famous Dravidians of the Bhāratīya history. They superimposed their hegemony over the original proto-Australoids of the Deccan. The Dravidian problem, here, emerges in a new light. It demolishes the myth of their pre-Āryan immigration to Bhārata. The Dravidians came long after the Brahmāryans set their foot on the Bhāratīya soil. What culture and civilization we ascribe to the assumed pre-Āryan Dravidians really belongs to the post-Āryan Dravidians. This discovery claims to correct several puranic myths and places the continuous flow of the Bhāratīya history in the right perspective.

The scheme of the work illustrates the dialectical, chronological and historical perspective and the organic critical method. The first five chapters, excluding the Introduction, deal with the pre-Āryan Bhāratīya ethnic stocks. The seventh chapter deals with the foreign Brahmic ethnology. The eighth chapter deals with the hybrid ethnic stocks. The organically amalgamated ethnology of the Varṇic system finds place in the nineth chapter. The latest foreign immigrants, the Dravidas, have been discussed in the last chapter. This brings us to the middle of the first millenium B. C. when we enter the historical period. This work really presents the pre-historic and the proto-historic people who played decisive roles in their respective ages. This work has tried to discover light not only from the literary sources but also from the other sciences which throw relevent lights on the particular subjects. The aides of the sciences of archaeology, anthropology, and the other ones have amply been invoked. This saves this work from the fault of one-sidedness. The pictures of the various ethnic stocks presented here is coherent and organic. They appear as inseparable parts of the flowing Bhāratīya history through the ages.

We Indians are very very sentimental, are prone to false ideas and tenaciously stick to them. Any critical scholar, and much more an organic critical scholar, is dubbed as anti-Indian even without enquiry. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar bemoaned this natural failing of the Indian scholars more than fifty

years ago and we can not claim to have learnt anything from his warnings. Rather we have gone down and are persistently and continuously going down in critical scholarship. It is specifically for this failing that the whole mass of the Indian scholars is today entertaining unhistorical and false beliefs. And if any one needs proof of this thesis, he needs only to attend the sessions of the All India Oriental Conference, the Indian History Congress and the several States History Congresses. We could forgive Indological chauvinism led by K. P. Jayaswal during the period of freedom struggle but the continuation of this cultural chauvinism is an unpardonable crime in independent India. We have to re-learn our culture and civilization very rightly so that we may rightly plan over future. This chauvinism is responsible for dismal degradation of research standards. In this stagnating and gruesome atmosphere, the wily eyes may look askance at this work. I do not claim to present anything new. I only follow up the realities discovered by various modern sciences which the modern Indian scholars do not like to do far various reasons, fear from the traditionalists being one amongst the many. We had been complaining against the history books written by the foreigners and hence, the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan planned the writing of a history and culture of the Indian people, as seen through the "Indian" eyes. I have adopted some basic findings of the first volume of this series. It supports the theory of the foreign origin of the Āryans. It places the redation of the Ṛgveda C. 1000 B. C. The orientalists and the historians shall never rightly understand the culture and civilization of Bhārata unless they accept, without any reservation, the great historical event of the foreign Brahmāryan military conquest of Bhārata in the fourth quarter of the second millenium B. C. If the scholars follow up these basic historical truths with integrity, they shall have to arrive at the truths discovered in this research work. One-thing this work claims to have achieved. It opens the way for the coming young scholars to holdly and fearlessly follow up the hard truths brought to light by the modern sciences.

We had gone down to the farthest limit in cultural degradation under the successive Brahmic, the Muslim and the British foreign dominations; tribal, feudal and imperialist; and we, today, are witnessing a colossal cultural degradation and stagnation. We need great courage and wisdom to break this stagnation and usher in the era of freedom and equality in culture. We can not achieve this purpose unless we rightly understand our cultural heritage. We shall then wage an incessant war against what is traditional, obscurantist, ritualist and parochial, other names of materialism, in our culture and re-win what is permanent, enduring, freedom and equality, other names of spiritualism, in our culture. We shall, then, win the cultural revolution that would wide open the flood-gates of truth, progress and happiness.

The right re-interpretation of the origins, growth and the historical plays of the various ethnic groups through the incessant flow of the ancient Bhāratīya history is the purpose of this work. The author humbly claims to have achieved this purpose for his own as well as for the Bhāratīya nations balanced movement forward.

INTRODUCTION

The World Ethnological Problem

The ethnological problem of the ancient world is still shrouded in mystery. The ethnological composition of ancient Egypt, ancient Sumer, Ancient Crete and Argos, ancient South America and ancient Bhārata is still only faintly known to the scholars of ancient cultures and civilizations in spite of the more than two centuries of researches in the field. Only a fringe of the problem has been touched so far. The archaeologists have excavated the material relics of these ancient cultures and civilizations for us. They have given us their human remains and the languages of the people The languages and scripts of Egypt and Sumer, the Hieroglyphics and the Cuneiform respectively, have satisfactorily been deciphered but the linguists have not touched the ethnological aspects of the people speaking these languages. The anthropologists have rendered better service, though limited, by examining their body-structures. The anthropological division of mankind roughly into the the Negroids, the Australoids, the Mediterraneans, the Mangoloids, the Western Brachycephals and the Nordics is more or less a geographical conception It does indirectly help the ethnological problem but does not solve it The scripts and the languages of Crete and Bhārata have not satisfactorily been deciphered. The pre-Āryan ethnological problem of the ancient world fruitfully deserves better attention than it has so far received from the research scholars

Ethnological Problem of Bhārata

The world ethnological problem assumes the most complex form in Bhārata. The linguists, the historians and the indological scholars have touched upon this problem. The earlier savants like Kern, Burgess, Fleet, Abbott, Kirfel,

Pargiter, Lassen, Martin, Maccrindle, Cunningham and some others attempted the problem, though critically, but only from a view of the discovery of the ethnic groups and their geographical habitat. B. C. Law and D. C. Sircar have treated the problem from the factual point of view. The line of research upto now has been to discover a particular ethnic group or tribe, to collect facts scattered here and there regarding that tribe, lump together those facts and give a picture of that tribe and its habitat. But the ethnic problem goes much beyond this simple treatment. The prime necessity is to discover the origin of the particular ethnic group. Its social structure, economic behaviour, political organisation and ideological directions are far more important than has presently been appreciated The nature, character, tradition and history of the different ethnic groups has moulded the progress of the Bhāratīya humanity and they have to be comparatively analysed and scientifically examined. All these factors mould the way of life of a particular ethnic group and that directs the determining trends and periods of history. It is true that the purity of blood is a myth but it is also true that the people of a particular predominant blood move in a specific direction The might of the blood cannot be under-rated without peril. The blood conditioned by geography and inheritance has proved a mighty force in history. The ethnological problem, hence, has to be subjected and scrutinised according to a scientific plan with a purpose. The scientific plan should prescribe the treatment of the subject in its origin, growth, inheritance, geography, coalescences and materiality to determine the nature, character and ideology of a particular group. We have to be very clear and specific in our purpose also. Varna and caste are the most exercising factors on the Bhāratīya minds but they have outlived their historicity and have been assigned, like the Indian Princes, to the sanctuaries of the museums. Any one of the Brāhmaṇa and the other respective descending Varṇas and castes follow the occupations and professions of all the rest of the Varṇas and the castes. The Varnas and the castes do not exist in practice though they are still the weapons of

exploitation and aggrandisement. Our purpose today is not to subject the problem of Varṇa and caste from its utility or disutility, scientific or unscientific and traditional or non-traditional point of view because the problem does not exist in that aspect. The purpose should be the heritage, the ideology that it has introduced in our national life and thinking. The purpose of our research should be to unravel facts, trends and directions sifting them from the huge mass of unearthed material; linguistic, archaeological, anthropological, geographical, geological and otherwise; with the organic, critical and sceintific method. A Man is slave to none-else than his ideology The materiality in our ideology is the cause of the ruin of humanity. We have to banish that materiality from the real human thinking. This foreign element in human thinking is introduced by some historical ethnic group, hence the historic importance of the analysis and diagnosis of the ancient ethnology. Our Bhāratīya ideology, along with that of the rest of humanity, has become perverted and tempered with due to historical causes fashioned by particular ethnic groups. Humanity is incessantly attempting to right its ideology for further progress and that should be the endeavour of every scholar and statesman. The scientific treatment of the subject in this work with this purpose is this my first humble attempt in this field.

Two Antagonistic But Basic Races in the Ṛgveda

The Ṛgveda is the first written Āryan record. The Ṛgveda is the most ancient written word in India. I love the Ṛgveda most and the Ṛgveda influences my mind most the Ṛgveda is the mine of jewels for historians. But the teaching that the Ṛgveda contains no history pains me. These lovers of the Ṛgveda attempt to air off the grounded feet of the Ṛgveda and want to uproot it without rehabilitating it because nothing can be rehabilitated in the air. The Ṛgveda is the most important source that throws flood of light on the ethnic problem of Bhārata. The Ṛgveda is the history of the two mutually opposed ethnic groups, the Āryans and the Bhāratiyans. The former are white-skinned; the later are dark-skinned. The former are

village people, the later are city-people. The former are tribalists, the later are republicans. Both spoke languages unintelligible to each other. The former are devoid of wealth and riches and the later are rich and the wealthy people. The former knew no art and architecture; the latter knew them to the point of perfection. The former are materialists and the later are spiritualists. We may add many more instances to this list. This mutually opposed nature, character and ideology of these two contenders suggests them to be two mutually opposed groups, not the two sections of one ethnic group. If the Āryans and the Dāsa-Dasyus (the Bhāratīyans) had been of the one and the same ethnic stock; both the sections should have been white-complexioned and black-complexioned; both should have been village and city people; both should have been the poor and the rich people; Indra should have been both the Purandara and the Pura-Pati; also Vṛtra and Śambare should have not only been pura-pati but Purandara also as they also broke the Āryan habitats defeating them several times in war; both must have understood the language of each other if they were brothers though warring; both should have worshipped Śiśnadevas and Munis. Both should have been Yājñics and both should have followed the same way of life. The war might have been necessitated owing to the uncontrolled materialistic greed of the one against the other but that could not have been the cause of these fundamental and foundational differences This clearly suggests that the two Ṛgvedic contenders belonged to two mutually opposed ethnic groups having nothing in common; the former ethnic group with military might and materialistic ideology bent upon subjugating the material richness of the latter militarily weak ethnic group. This discussion also silences the jingoistic savants who advocate the theory of Sapta-Sindhu as the original Āryan home. The Ṛgveda clearly postulates and unequivocably echoes the factum of the foreign invasion and occupation by the Āryans over the western Bhārata-land, later to become Brahmāvarta. It definitely negates all other theories to the contrary. This Ṛgvedic light solves many knotty problems of our ancient ethnology.

The Brahma and the Austric

Archaeological excavations at pre-Āryan Bhāratīya sites in Punjab have yielded inscriptions and human skeletal remains. The proto-Brāhmī script of Mohenjodaro and Harappa has not yet satisfactorily been deciphered hence its help is not available to the ethnological problem. The skeletal remains suggest Australoid ethnic stock with Mediterranean influences. Anthropology has thrown some light on the problem but not yet decisive. The linguistics attracted the earliest oriental scholars but they remained too much engrossed in the Sanskrit language and that also particularly with the Vedic Sanskrit. That gave them only the post-Āryan vision. The Dravidian language and script, next, attracted them. The fundamental differences between the Āryan and the Dravidian language led them to believe that the Dravidian language was pre-Āryan and hence the Dravidian ethnic stock populated the whole of Bhārata before the Āryan invasions. The traditions once believed as true always die hard. The oldest Dravidian written record does not go beyond the middle of the first Millenium A. D. and the Drāviḍī script beyond the second century B. C. Archaeology could not take the Dravidian remains before the third century B. C. Anthropology has not helped the Dravidian problem either. But none of these self-revealing truths have been successful in killing the traditional beliefs even of the comparative, critical scholars. Scholars like Sylvain Levi, John Perzyluski, Jules Bloch and others went into the basic sabstratum of the Āryan languages and advocated the theory that the pre-Āryan and the pre-Dravidian Austric languages could as well provide the substratum to the foreign words in the Āryan languages. The foreign words in Sanskrit can be explained by the Austric language also along with the Dravidian language. This revelation is of great importance for the study of the ethnological problem. If the present day Dravidians, as has been shown in this work, intruded into Bhārata in the post-Āryan period, our whole vision changes. Then there are no Dravidians, no Dravidian language and no-Drāviḍī script in the pre-Āryan Bhārata. This thesis revolutionizes our whole outlook. We then have

to fall back upon solely upon the Austric culture, civilization, language, script, traditions and history in the pre-Āryan Bhārata. Bhārata has not yet been studied from the Austric point of view which is an imperative necessity for the oriental scholars and scientists who are dying to unearth the oriental truth in the ages goneby. The Āryan and the Dravidian provide no solution to the Bhāratīya ethnic problem. The Austric is the master-key to Bhāratīya ethnology and hence of Bhāratīya culture and civilization. The Ṛgveda gives us glimpses of pure pre-Bhāratīya Brahma society, of pure pre-Āryan and pre-Dravidian Bhāratīya society and of the coalesced Brahmo-Bhāratīya society. The coalesced culture continues through the Brāhmaṇas, the Upanisads, and the Sūtras. The Brahmo-Bhāratīya coalesced culture is a historical development of north India. Then an other factor forces itself. The Dravidians occupy Draviḍāvarta or the Deccan in the middle of the first millenium B. C. The Draviḍo-Bhāratīya coalesced society evolves in the Deccan. Both the coalesced societies meet in the third century B. C. and within a century or so both the north Indian and the south Indian coalesced societies evolve a further coalesced society. This coalesced society finds its presentation in the Purānas. The Vedic, the Brāhmaṇa, the Upaniṣadic and the Sūtra cultures belong to north India but the Purāṇic culture-creation keeps the whole Bhārata in view. That is the beauty of the Purāṇas if we only can divest them of the transferences, transpositions and the fabrications of the times, events and personalities, i.e., if we can only unbrāhmaṇise these brāhmanised versions of the true events and traditions of pre-Āryan and pre-Dravidian Bhārata.

Austric Interpretation of Purānas

The Purānas still exercise the greatest influence on the Brāhmana society in spite of Swami Dayanand. Next come the Brāhmanas of the magico-ritualistic sacerdotal order. The Vedic and the Upanisadic literature has the least hold on them. The Ṛgveda has only come to occupy the position of the British monarch in the multiracial common-wealth. Its utility, alongwith those of the Upaniṣads, has completely ceased. The Purāṇas are the creations of the

pre-Brāhmaṇic and pre-Dravidian elements of the coalesced society in the Brāhmaṇic commonwealth under the monarchy of the Ṛgveda. This brahmanised and Draviḍised Austric Vāk betrays its original traditions and historical events. The ethnic material in the Purāṇas has been studied from the Brāhmanic point of view. Though conscions of the fraudulent Brāhmaṇic version of the Kṣatriya or pre-Brahma Purāṇas, Pargiter, even then, falls prey to the Brāhmanic fraud. The ethnic history of Bhārata was largely constructed by him from the brahmanised Purāṇas. Pusalkar betrays a Brāhmaṇic bias. S B. Chowdhari does not recognise the constituents that go to make the Purānas. Our critical researches into the Purānas is very meagre. It has thoroughly been studied from the Brāhmanic point of view. It has very little been studied from the Dravidian point of view. It has not at all been studied from the pre-Āryan and the pre-Dravidian Austric point of view. The Austric interpretation of the Purāṇas is very very essential for the true construction of the Bhāratīya ethnological history in particular and the Bhāratīya history in general. The present attempt at the construction of the ethnology of ancient Bhārata is generally based upon these foregoing observations.

Basic Origins

I have gone in this work to the basic origins of the ethnic composition of Bhārata since the first foreign invasions on Bhārata in the fourth quarter of the second millenium B. C. It is almost impossible to construct the chronological ethnic history of various regions of Bhārata at the present state of our knowledge. Only the true Austric interpretation of the Purānas, at some future date, may help us in constructing the Northern, the Eastern, the Western, the Far Western, the Central and the Southern Divisions of Bhārata. We can only vaguely assert that the Ikṣvākus and the Ahis or the Nagnas or the Nāgas populated the whole of Bhārata and far-western Bhārata in the pre-Āryan period. The Ikṣvākus have been acclaimed as the original masters of the whole of

Bhārata unanimously by the Jaina, the Brāhmaṇic and the Buddhistic traditions. This unanimity is continued for the Bharatas also but with a difference. Though the Brāhmaṇic tradition accepts the Ikṣvāku Bharata giving his name to this land of ours but an other competetor to Bharata is fabricated in certain Purānas to dislodge at some future date this Ikṣvāku Bharata and this Brāhmanic fraud proved fruitful as designed. The Goeblised Dausyanti Bharata is a pure Purānic fabrication. Dauṣyanti Bharata has been dismissed by all the serious scholars. The Ikṣvākus and the Bharatas appear to be of the pre-Āryan Austric ethnic stock. The Ahis or the Nāgas have unanimously been accepted even by the Brāhmanas and the Draviḍas belonging to the Austric race. The Austric supremacy of Bhārata continued till twelfth century B. C. in western Bhārata, till seventh century B. C. in Uttarapradesh, till roughly second century B. C. in Eastern Bhārata and till fifth century .B. C. in Deccan. The ethnic history of Bhārata after the complete Brāhmanisation and Dravidization of Bhārata circa second century B.C. is the history of the coalesced Bhāratiya ethnology. The nebulous ethnic formations took their roots within this period, i.e. circa 1100 B. C.–200 B. C.

Evolution of Ethnology

The Purānas transmit to us a vast unmanageable list of the ethnic stocks occupying one or the other regions of Bhārata. It is generally believed that the ethnical names were given to geographical units; big or small, according to the bigness or smallness of the ethnic unit. The Bṛhat-saṁhitā gives 49 and the Vāyu Purāna 91 ethnic names for northern division of Bhārata. They respectively give 33 and 41 ethnic names for central division of Bharata, 33 and 48 ethnic names for eastern division of Bhārata. North western division has 21 ethnic names according to the Bṛhat-Saṁhitā and north-eastern division 35 according the Bṛhat-Saṁhitā and 44 according to the Vāyu Purāṇa. The western division had 17 and 36 ethnic names respectively according to the Bṛhat-Saṁhitā and the Vāyu Purāṇa. Very few ethnic names of the Deccan have been given. Whatever names have been given belong to the historical period. The

Purāṇas could not give any ethnic names of the Deccan because the Ahi or Nāga ethnic stock continually remained in complete mastery of their land till the Dravidian military conquest and the Brāhmanas had not by then intruded into the Deccan. Bhārata had witnessed the Greek, the Scythian and the Huna foreign military invasions after the Brahmāryan and the Dravidian foreign military invasions and the Purānic lists of these ethnic names include many of these new elements also. These later violent intruders had merged themselves completely in the Hindu society of Bhārata, as the earlier Brāhmaṇic and The Dravidian violent intruders had merged themselves in the Austric society of Bhārata. From Austric society to Hindu society, is an interesting chapter of Bhāratīya history. If we rightly know the nature and character of this transition, we would rightly assess the nature and character of the Hindu society. This gives added significance to the formation of the ethnic groups in this transitional but formative period of the Bhāratīya history.

Ahi Problem

The Ikṣvāku and the Bharata problem is a bit easier than the Ahi or the Nāga problem. The Ahis were definitely non-Āryans. The Purānas have made Kaśyapa a Brāhmaṇa and gave his fatherhood to the Ahis or the Nāgas. The whole brunt of the Ṛgvedic wars fell upon the Ahis. Their progenitor Kaśyapa, son of Marichi, has not been accepted by the Brāhmaṇa hierarchy as the progenitor of a true Brāhmaṇa race and gotra. He progenated the race of the Dānavas and the Daityas. He was associated with the Dānava system of matriarchy. Though Kaśyapa Mārīcha has been made a Ṛgvedic Ṛṣi but that is after Dāśarājña-War coalescence when several Dānava and Daitya wise men rose to the ranks of Ṛṣis in the Ṛgveda. Dānava Kaśyapa had similarly also been raised to the Ṛgvedic Ṛṣi-hood and the Purāṇic Brāhmaṇa-hood. Kaśyapa; father or no father; Ahi or Nāga race has not been accepted by any scholar as a Brāhmaṇic race or an Āryan tribe. Then, who are these Ahis ? Are they Dravidians or the Austrics ? This is the real problem.

Ahis are Austrics

The Dravidian literature does not know of Kaśyapa or the Ahi or the Nāga race. The real Dravidian literature belongs to the post-Gupta age and the Nāgas had been completely annihilated in the Golden Age of the Brāhmaṇic Gupta era. The linguistic study of the Drāviḍī suggests that it superimposed itself on the pre-existing Austric language. That is the conclusion arrived at by the Dravidian linguists, archaeologists and the anthropologists. The whole Deccan was populated by the Nāgas and the Haihayas when the Dravidian hero Paraśurāma destroyed their power. He subjugated them physically and imposed his Drāviḍī language culturally. Thus the Nāgas and the Austric language become inseparable. The conclusion becomes irresistible that the Nāgas and the Haihayas of the Deccan spoke the Austric language.

Deccan Ethnology

We now enter the knotty problems of our history. There are riddles. The complexity increases It becomes diversified and many-sided. The north increases the complexity; the south helps to solve it. We have brought down our Drāviḍic subject till the establishment of the Sātavāhana rule in the third century B. C. we then enter the historical period. The ethnic formations, if any, in Deccan were complete by that time. The Deccan inscriptions have revealed the existence of the Ṛgvedic Anu and the Ikṣvāku tribes. These inscriptions belong to second century A. D The Iksvākus—the servants of the Āndhras, on the disintegration of the Sātavāhana rule, established their power in Āndhradeśa. The Purānas have mentioned some other ethnic groups of the Deccan. Here the ethnic names are identical with the geographical names. The Purānas call Deccan Daksiṇāpatha, the whole region located south of Narmadā. The Āndhras, the Śabaras, the Pulindas, the Puṇḍras, the Mutibas, the Aśmakas, the Mūlakas, the Cholas, the Pāndyas, the Cheras or Keralas or Keralaputras or Ketalputras, the Kuntalas and the Damilas have been mentioned in the Purānas as the ethnic groups of the Deccan. The first five tribes the Pañcha-Kuśikas, descended from the

Dasyu-chief Viśvāmitra, and have been mentioned earliest in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa of the seventh century B. C. The Aśmakas and the Mūlakas are of the Ikṣvāku origin. The Chola, the Pāndya and the Chera are geographical names. Their people were so named as they resided in these regions. Their non-association with any ethnic groups shows them of later origin. The Kuntalas may be associated with the Ikṣvākus of the later historical period. The Damilas later came to be identified with the particular eastern region of the Deccan and its residents, the Tāmilas. The word Damila, at the beginning, denoted the whole country of Deccan and its population but by and by it came to be displaced by the word Draviḍa and its connotation came to be limited to the Tāmila-land and the Tāmila-people. The post-Dravidian Deccan ethnology, thus, appears only an offshoot, a branch of the northern ethnology. The problems and the riddles, hence, have to be solved in relation to the northern ethnology.

Northern Ethnology

The Pañchajātaḥ are the most important Ṛgvedic ethnic groups. This problem reveals its complexity in the opposite order. They are definitely non-Dravidian. The Purāṇas do not associate the Pūrus, the Yadus, the Turvaśas, the Anus and the Druhyus with Deccan. The Draviḍas do not claim them as their kith and kin. Nobody associates them with the Dravidian ethnology. The problem is . are the Pañchajātāḥ Austrics or Brahmāryans ? Their earliest habitat is the Saraśwatī region which included the modern states of Afghanistan, Baluchistan, Punjab Sindh, Rajasthan, Saurāstra and a part of Gujerat. The Purāṇas claim them to be of the Āryan ethnic stock. The Vedic and the Brāhmaṇa evidences go counter to the Purāṇic claims. They are deeply associated in blood and territory with the Ikṣvāku and the Ahi ethnic stocks. The Haihaya Yadus are the Austric people speaking the Austric language. Their progenitors could not be otherwise. Viśvāmitra, one of the greatest Austric progenitors, descended from Pūrus, the Aikṣvāku-Ahis. The Turvaśas always accompany the Yadus. The Anus and the Druhyus also belong to this ethnic stock. The descendands of these ethnic stocks now occupy

the above referred regions. If a critical and scientific study of the languages of these regions is made to discover their subtratum and their influences on the language of the Ṛgveda, I believe, that the Austric culture, civilization, traditions and history will triumphantly reveal themselves with unrivalled glory than we may even presently conceive. The Pañchajātāḥ people, the Dāsas and the Dasyus of the Ṛgveda and the Asuras of the Purānas, were the Austric people speaking the Austric language. All other ethnic stocks of northern Bhārata may be traced to the Ikṣvāku race or its Ahi sub-race. The Austric people, speaking their Austric language, were the masters of the whole of Bhārata before the Brahmāryan and the Dravidian military conquests.

Brahma Ethnology

I have treated the subject of the Brahmāryan ethnology with some wider view point in order to unmix the later ethnic mixtures and in order to understand their original purer state. The treatment of the Devas and the Asuras, like the treatment given to the Vṛtras, the Panis, the Rākṣasas and others, is of historical significance because the Brahma Devas later in the Śatapatha age become the Brāhmanas and the Asuras are transmitted as their adversaries, the Ksatriya's and their associates. The Brahma was the one undivided ethnic whole and the historians should not minimise the power and prestige of the united one race, the Brahma race. The Angirasas and the Vasiṣṭhas are not separate ethnic stocks. Some specific classified groups were so called for their professions and achievements. They got ethnic names later. They are the only pure Brāhmaṇa ethnic groups, if we take the liberty to so call them. The Bhṛgus had heralded the origin of the mixed ethnological stocks; the mixture of the two mutually opposed ethnic stocks. So were the Kurus.

Varṇic Ethnology

The objection may be raised that some tens of thousands of the Brahmāryan invaders could not subjugate and brāhmaṇise a land of tens of millions in a few centuries; that

history may understand the political subjugation but the whole-sale cultural conversion is undigestible. The history does not afford any parallel to this peculiar phenomenon. The objection at the first sight appears to be invincible but the deeper comprehension of the Brahmāryan diplomacy gives us some light. The Brahmāryans after their political victory in the Dāśarājña war did not pursue their military career of conquests further. They adopted the more subtle diplomacy. They chose the strategy of cultural triumph through distribution of political gains, also to their erstwhile adversaries, within the ambit of the Brahma .social machine. They, thus, won the wisdom of their adversaries. The large scale conversions of the Bhāratīya people to the Brahma fold gave new vigour, new power and newer prestige to the conquerers and the coalesced society was the result. The coalescence of the two mutually opposed ethnic races is at the root of the origin and growth of the Varnic ethnology. The Brahma race transforms itself into the Brāhmaṇa race. The non-Āryan non-sacrificing Bhāratīya race known as the Ksatriya race (also comprising within them the socalled Vaiśyas and the Śūdras of the Brāhmaṇic conception)'stood against this Brāhmana race. They are the Dāsas and the Dasyus of the Ṛgveda, also, otherwise called the Śūdras in the Atharvaveda. The Brahmāryan-Dāsa Dasyu dichotomy of the Rgveda became Brāhmana-Kṣatriya dichotomy in the later Vedic literature But far and far more numbers from them had continued to be drawn into the Brāhmanic fold. The conquerors' society was growing while the conquereds' society shrinking not only territorially, politically, socially and economically but also culturally. The conquered society then was very powerful in all the fields and only cultural penetration could bear fruits in the other fields. The coalesced society in this process assimilated much of the original culture and civilization and the conquerers became one with the conquered in eulogising the land as their own, the Bhāratīya culture and civilization as their own and the Bhāratīya script and language as their own. This attitude in course of time obliterated all the past memories of the conquerer and the conquered

and the former became more and more vehement in claiming the land of their adoption as their own. They suffered rule of their adversary Kṣatriyas for full one thousand years, i.e. from 1100 B. C. to 150 B. C., when the first Brāhmaṇa ruler assumed kingship to himself. The Brāhmanas by this time had won the greatest and the farthest cultural integration. The dipolomacy of the cultural conquest proved right. Its most efficient weapon was the Varṇic system with Brahma and Yajña at its foundation The history of Bhārata in this age; i.e., between circa 1100 B. C. and 150 B. C., is not only the history of the Brāhmanisation of Bhārata. It is really the history of the Śramanisation of the Brāhmana race and the Brāhmanisation of the Śramanic people or the victory of the Āryan and the Austric over each other. The assumption in the objection that the minority Brāhmanas brāhmanised a far greater majority proves to be wrong and one-sided. The minority successively and successfully succeeded in turning itself into a majority for which it had to pay heavily in culture-coins The Brāhmaṇisation of the Śramanic people went side by side the Śramaṇisation of the Brahma system. The Varnic ethnology is the living example of this cultural assemblage The Varnic ethnology originates over the ruins of the two ethnic stocks and itself becomes the origin of the later Jātivāda or caste-system. The one divides into many and we have the resultant numerous and innumerable ethnic groups, now, warring with each other. When this successful diplomacy intruded into Deccan in the third century B. C., the history repeated itself. Deccan joined the main current of northern Bhārata. The history of Bhārata proceeded more or less as a continuation of this diplomacy throughout its length and breadth after second century B. C. The process of cultural assemblage and assimilation, side by side the destruction and annihilation of the dissenters, continued unabated till the intrusion of the Muslim power in Bhārata. The Scythians, the Hunas and a few others came and submerged themselves in the main current. This study of the ancient ethnology of Bhārata would help us in correctly assessing the nature and character of the later Muslim and European invasions, by land or by

sea, and in correctly deciphering the cause of the movement of the Indian history as it did.

Austriatics

The Austric, the Brahma and the Draviḍa are the three oldest main ethnic currents of Bhārata. These three ethnic currents had their distinct ideologies and the ways of life. Our national constitution was forged by the actions, reactions and interactions of these three currents The nature and the character of the evolved culture and civilization of our national life before the Muslim invasion was forged by these forces A distinct break then occurs. The subsequent Muslim and the European invasions complicated the matter. The earlier Jewish, Christian and Iranian immigrations though peaceful still maintained their separate entities. They did not merge themselves in the national life. We have today become a noisy conundrum of multiple ideas and ideologies introduced in our national life by these various ethnic groups. The ideas and ideologies and the ways of life of the European, the Muslim, the Dravidian and the Brahmic ethnic races have amply been studied. The ideas, the ideology and the way of life of the Austric race has very scantily been studied. The scientific rediscovery of the Austric culture, civilization, tradition, history and way of life is the historical necessity of the age. The dialectical and chronological study of the cultural and scientific development of the Bhāratīya people from the Austric to the British would reveal much more truths and correct many more accumulated untruths. The scientific study of Austriatics, as I would like to name this Science, would also put in proper perspective the researches done, being done and to be done regarding the aforesaid Brahmic, Dravidian and other races.

The Purpose

The disagreers may point us a danger, the danger of the disintegrating forces scaring up. I do not believe in this danger, in this scare. The institutions of the race and the religion since long are dead leaving us the legacy of the

disintegrating forces of casteism, ritualism, regionalism and parochialism. These our disintegrating forces are the results of history. We have to unantiquate and modernise and also to antiquate and unmodernise ourselves. Modernisation means the unhindered fulfilment of the individual in freedom. Antiquitisation means the consignment of the forces of hinderances and obstructions, in the due fulfilment of the individual in freedom, to the oblivion of history. Freedom, peace and unity belong to antiquity but they have to be modernised. Violence, exploitation and disintegration belong to the modern but they have to be antiquated. This we cannot successfully accomplish in Bhārata till we rightly understand Austriatics, the culture and civilization of the pre-Āryan people of Bhārata. The deviations and perversions in our national thinking and consequential conduct are the gifts of the post-Austric foreign people. The study of Austriatics itself and the later history in Austriatic light would suggest us as to what we have to discard from our ideology and way of life as foreign to our innate making and help us in the reconstruction of our true and real innate way This our purified national thinking and conduct would alone bring us out of the morass of our present chaos, turmoil, disaster and disintegration. This study of the ethnology of ancient Bhārata is a part of the science of Austriatics and hence a force for our national integration. This study reveals to us the making in history of the collective institutions of violence and exploitation and their human bearers. This study needs to be supplemented by organical critical researches in other branches of the Science of Austriatics This is a gigantic task but gigantic ends can not be achieved without gigantic right efforts.

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

1. INTRODUCTION

The factum of the foreign Brahmāryan invasion of Bhārata in the later part of the second millenium B. C. has generally been accepted. It has also been admitted that the Bhāratīyans and the Brahmāryans belonged to two different and distinct races clearly distinguishable from each other. It has also been conceded that the victorious Brahmāryans converted en masse their vanquished adversaries to their fold and thus swelled their minority ranks by large numbers. But, unfortunately, so far, the necessary logical deductions resulting from these widely accepted premises have not satisfactorily been worked out. The problem of the composition of the Bhāratīya race and the Brahmāryan race, like Asura-Māyā, is still deluding inspite of the best and the most perseverent works of the great pioneers in the field. F. E. Pargiter carried on monumental researches in this field and in spite of many advanced studies by various scholars in the field subsequent to him; his theories still offer the only fair basis for further research work in the field [1] Pargiter accepted the trustworthiness of the Purāṇas too literally for constructing the traditional history of India that he, an eminent judge of the Calcutta High Court, did not judicially pursue his own tests to their logical relevent results. He establishes the date of the composition of the Ṛgveda circa 980 B. C. [2] Dauṣyanti Bharata, the forty-fourth King in the Dynastic list prepared by him, is said to have fought the Satvants but Satvant appears as sixtyfifth king in the same list after the Dāśarājña war. He has formulated a test, along with several others, that the Brāhmaṇas did not always distinguish between different periods and often misplaced

1. R. C. Majumdar; The Vedic Age; 1957; Page 26.

2. F. E. Pargiter; Ancient Indian Historical Tradition; 1962; Page 318.

persons chronologically in chapter V of his book. Bharata, according to this test, has to be brought down after the Dāśarājña war. Bharatas are the Brahmāryan opponents in Dāśarājña war. Pargiter should have searched for another Bharata in the Purāṇas. And there exists one Bharata in the Purānas. He is the grandson of Priyavrata, a son of Svāyambhuva Manu. The synchronism of Dausyanti Bharata with Kākṣivant son of Dīrghatamas, thus also stands disproved. Next, Dāsas, Dasyus and Asuras belonged to a certain race but that has not rightly been appreciated He equates Iksvākus with Dravidians and Saudyumnas with Mundās or Kolarians. Were the Dravidians Ikṣvākus and the proto-Australoid Muṇḍās Dāsas, Dasyus and Asuras? Pargiter has treated them as if they were the component tribes of the Ailas

These glaring inconsistencies and contradictions necessitate research into this problem afresh. The problem of ancient Indian historical tradition has not been satisfactorily solved. The problem even after the strenuous efforts of many savants in the field is still a burning one The traditional history is a clue to understand the life of the people of that age and their convictions, beliefs and their way of life. The traditional history does not exist in a coherent form. It only eixsts in fragments. The interpretations of the various events of the traditional history is of supreme importance to understand the directions of the ancient cultures and civilizations But these events can not satisfactorily be interpreted till we understand the true picture of the races, tribes and personalities partaking in these events. This necessity prominently throws to us the problem of the ancient ethnology. The ethnology as such, today, is in the melting pot. No pure ethnic group exists. We can not distinguish between different groups of the human society. No pure Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya and Śūdra exist. We have all become one. But our ideologies and convictions draw us sometimes to opposite directions. We have, hence, to understand the forces that drive us to these opposite directions. These forces are the resultant growths of the dialectical actions and reactions of different ways though now they have coalesced into one unit. That is of supreme importance

to meet the challenge of ideology. The true understanding of the nature of ancient ethnology would provide us the master-key to interpret the various traditional historical events of pre-Āryan and post-Āryan Bhārata.

The problem has been tackled by Pargiter from the Āryan and non-Āryan standpoint. He equates the Mānavas, principally the Ikṣvākus and their branches, with the non-Āryan Dravidians and Saudyumnas with the non-Āryan Muṇḍās or the proto-Australoids. He, in his researches, was largely influenced by the linguistic researches of G. Grierson. The acceptance of the dicta of Griersonic linguism misdirected Pargiter's researches. His theory fails to explain some glaring events of traditional history. In the decisive Dāśarājña war, Paurava Sudās of Pargiter's Aila dynasty is opposed by Ailas and Saudyumnas. No Ikṣvākus figure here. If Pūrus were Iksvākus, as they rightly were, the whole theory of Pargiter topples down. There would be no Āryans then. We may add many more instances to the wrong ethnology enunciated by Pargiter. Pusalkar, on the contrary, deals with the problem on the assumption that all are Āryan. All the races and tribes have descended from the Āryan Manu.[3] The Ṛgveda itself demolishes this assumption. The Ṛgveda records the history of two hostile races Both the assumptions are faulty and do not solve the problem.

We need a fresh approach to solve this vital problem. The Ṛgveda holds the key. The Rgveda records the Brahmāryan history of conquest over their adversaries, the Bhāratīyans. If we logically follow the natural consequences of this historical truth the whole truth shall reveal itself to us. For this purpose, new principles have to be discovered; new tests have to be formulated.

2. THE TESTS

Neo-Bhāratīya tradition.

The Division of the Bhāratīya tradition into Brāhmanic and Kṣatriya appears to be prima facie wrong. The Purāṇas

3. A. D. Pusalkar; Traditional History from the Earliest Times (in Vedic Age above), Chapter XIV; pages 272-273.

took their present shape in the Gupta period. The Brahmāryan society, by then, had assimilated largely vast sections of the orginal population whom they had earlier conquered. The Purāṇas depict the culture and civilization of this mixed society. We have to understand the Purāṇas in a dialectico-chronological way. The Paurāṇikas believe that the Brāhmana, who may know the four Vedas with the Aṅgas and Upaniṣads, should not really be (regarded as) having attained proficiency, if he should not thoroughly know the Purāna. He should reinforce the Veda with the Itihāsa and the Purāṇa. The Veda is afraid of him who is deficient in tradtion, (thinking) 'he will do me hurt.'[4] The students of the Purāṇa have now to change this guiding principle into quite another guiding principle. It would be like this, "He who has not attained proficiency in the Vedas, the Aṅgas and the Upaniṣads shall not rightly know the Purāṇas. He should reinforce the Purāna from the Veda, the Brāhmanas and the Upanisads. The Purāna fears him who knows not the Vedas. He shall not meet the Truth in the Purānas."

When we accept the factum of the foreign Āryan invasion of India, we, obviously, concede that the Āryans had their own tradition and their Bhāratīya adversaries, their own tradition. The Āryan (Brahmāryan) tradition on their entry in Bhārata was based on the social system of Yajña and Brahma. That may be called the Brahmic tradition. The tradition of their Bhāratīya adversaries was founded upon the social system of Jana and spirituality. We call it the Śramanic tradition. The Brāhmaṇical and Śramaṇic traditions coalesced together after the Brahmāryans settled permanently in Brahmāvarta and adopted the policy of mass-scale conversions of their adversaries to their fold. The two traditions reacted and interacted upon each other. The Śramanic ideology influenced the Brahmic way so much that, apart from the Brahmic base the Brahma way adopted most of the elements of the Śramanic way. Ritualisation of Brahmic institutions and the Celestialisation of their heroes in the Ṛgveda start the

4. Pargiter; op. cit., page 1.

process culminating in the Upaniṣadic spiritual (though perverted) tenets. The Vedic literature contains more of its adversaries than of its own. The foreigners had not history of thier own going to antiquity. The Bhāratīyans had their history since immemorial antiquity. The Brahma way exercised unlicensed freedom in twisting this history to bring it in consonance with the basic Brahmic ideology. They freely used the art of transmissions and transferences. Roughly we may speak of the Yājñic Brahma way as the Brahmic tradition, with very little of tradition in it and the Jana Śramanic way as the Bhāratīya tradition, with very little true tradition allowed to be left in it. The Śramaṇised Brahma becomes Brahmaṇa. The adoption of the word "Ṇ" to form the compound with the word Brahma denotes the victory of asceticism or spiritualism on the materialistic Brahmic way. The follower of the Brahmaṇa way is a Brāhmaṇa. The Śramanic influenced Brāhmaṇic way retained its basic institutions of Yajña and Brahma and within this framework assimilated some necessary events, personalities, traditions and beliefs of the Jana Śramanic way, the Bhāratīya way. This Brāhmaṇic tradition, of necessity, could be small-statured in comparision to the very tall-statured Bhāratīya tradition. Hence the Rsis of the coalescence age felt the necessity of re-writing the ancient Bhāratīya history within the Brāhmaṇic framework. They chose to adopt fully and comprehensively the ancient Bhāratīya tradition to themselves to complement the small statured Brāhmaṇic tradition. This is the genesis of the hybrid Itihāsa and Purāna tradition born of the Brāhmaṇic and Bhāratīya traditions. The hybrid tradition born of the two opposing coalesced traditions was vastly predominated by the later, hence it naturally glorified the subjects of the later tradition. This new tradition evolved after the Dāśarājña war cannot be termed either the Brāhmanic tradition or the Bhāratīya tradiion. I do not also prefer to call it, like Pargiter, the Kṣatriya tradition. We do not find Kṣatriyas in the kernel of the Ṛgveda. Kṣatriya is first mentioned in the Tenth Maṇḍala of the Ṛgveda composed circa 800 B. C. The pre-Āryan Bhāratīya race, the Ikṣvāku race and the important Bhāratīya tribes such as

Pūrus, Yadus and others, along with important Bhāratiya personalities like Viśvāmitra, Purukutsa and others are not mentioned as Kṣatriyas in the Vedic literature. Kṣatra or Kṣatriya as a race or a tribe is a later development. The coalesced tradition had started to evolve much before the origin of the Ksatriya tribes. I would prefer to call this coalesced tradition as neo-Bhāratīya tradition owing to preponderance and predominance of the Bhāratīya tradition in it. This neo-Bhāratīya tradition is handed over to us in a jumbled state. The truth has to be sifted from the mass of untruth. We have to understand the basic principles and apply them in this historical process of analysis. We may now formulate the basic principles for the right understanding of the neo-Bhāratīya tradition.

First test of the Ṛgvedic evidence

Firstly ; the actual contacts between the Bhāratīyanas and the Brahmāryans took place in the later part of the first millenium B C. The Ṛgveda, thus, affords evidence nearest to reality. The Rgveda was composed circa 1000 B. C. It is not relevent here whether the Rgveda contains certain hymns going a few centuries earlier or not The relevent factor is the actual statement of a fact in the Rgveda. If anything contradictory to it appears in later literature that should be accepted as an innovation and hence should be generally discarded unless other factors go to corroborate it. The cases of Viśvāmitra [5] and Bhṛgu are in point. Viśvāmitra fights the Tṛtsus in Dāśarājña war along with Ahis, Dāsas and Asuras. He is the progenitor of Daśyus who ruled over wide parts of Bhārata. If any later literature describes him as a Brāhmana, that statement should not be accepted. Bhrgus[6] also fight against Sudās in Dāśarājña war. Apart from this single event, they are always depicted as Brāhmaṇas in the pre-Dāśarājña and post-Dāśarājña tradition. The only conclusion here that we may draw is that as certain pre-Āryan and non-Āryan tribes

5. Ṛgveda 3. 3. 5. 11–12, 7. 2. 16. 5–6–7. 5. 134, 8, 7. 2. 1. 18. 19.

6. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1. 6.

helped Sudās against their own kinsmen, similarly a few of people belonging to the invaders also helped against their own kinsmen. The evidence of the Ṛgveda should be given utmost credence. The Purāṇic evidence may be permitted to explain the Ṛgvedic evidence but not to contradict it.

Second test of Yajña

Secondly, the Brahmāryan culture centres round Yajña. The foundation of the Brahmāryan society is well-laid on the institution of Yajña. If certain tribes are A-yajñic before the Brahmāryan invasion and later they are found to have adopted the Yajña way ; that may only be explained by the event of their conversion to the Brahmāryan fold. For example, the ten confiderated Jana-leaders comprising of Pūrus, Anus, Druhyus, Śigrus, Yakṣus and others have been termed as A-yājñic. [7] If any of these tribes appear as peforming Yajñas in later literature we should understand that *it*, after its defeat in the Dāśarājña war, coalesced with the invading tribe or joined their fold and adopted their Yajñic way.

Third test of restoration of twisted history

Thirdly, the Brahmāryans have twisted history. It is only a travesty of truth to state that they lacked historical sense. They had a very short history of their own and that was the history of violence, exploitation, loot, and plunder. That could not be a fit subject for preservation in the new, changed set of circumstances. Their new adherants had brought with them rich and valuable historical records. These historical records could be brahmāryanised only by the twisting of real facts. The untruth gained supreme. The unholy method of Māyā or cover was adopted. The case of Madhu and Dhundhu is in point. Dhundhu [8] was son of Madhu. Madhu reigned from Madhuvana on the river Yamunā to Saurāstra and Ānarta (Gujerat). His daughter married Haryaśva, a scion of the Ikṣvāku race and their son was Yadu. Madhu was a Daitya and Dānava. [9] His son Dhundhu was killed

7. Ṛgveda 7. 5. 18. 7.

8. Mahābhārata (Critical Edition) 3. 193. 16.

9. Pargiter, op. cit., page 122.

by Kuvalāśva, ancestor of Haryaśva, two degrees above near a sand-filled sea.[10] Kuvalāśva had to cross the whole Rajputana desert He found Dhundhu on the sea shore. This was exactly the region which the later Yadus and Turvaśas populated on the southern part of the desert about the Rann of Cutch. Dhundhu is also known as a king who abstained from eating meat[11] as were Nahuṣa[12] and Yayāti[13] A descendant of Yayāti Pūru, Prāchīnvant had carried on invasions to the east. The Pūrus till the final redaction of the Ṛgveda are associated with Sindh-Punjab region only. The incursions of Prāchīnvant thus appear to be on Ikṣavāku territories. Paurava Sudhanvan flourished during the time of Kuvalāśva. Pargiter places Dhundhu with Sudhanvan.[14] The historical event now crystalises like this Madhu was a Pūru scion. There might have been some ancestral rivalry between the Pūru and the Ikṣvāku houses His son Dhundhu was killed in battle with Kuvalāśva. Dhundhu's sister was given in marriage to Kuvalāśva's descendant Haryaśva. Yadu sprang from Ikṣvāku-Pūru blood It will later be noticed that the Pūrus and the Yadus originally belonged to the Ahi sub-race of the Iksvāku race. This event appears to be the first historical conflict between the then two sections of the Iksvāku race of Bhārata. Matrimonial alliances of the Pūrus and Yadus ; Matinārā's daughter Gauri's marriage with Yavanāśva II and Śaśabindu's daughter Bindumatī's marriage with Māndhātṛ, the son of Yuvanāśva II, with the Iksvāku scions brought them again still closer.

Fourth test of unravelling of jumps

Fourthly, we discover certain great jumps in the Pūrāṇas. The Brahmāryans had largely converted the Dāsas, Dasyus and Raksas to their fold. Their historical tradition could not be literally digested by their new masters. The important

10. Pargiter, op. cit., page 260.

11. Mahābhārata (Gita Press) Anuśāsana Parva, 115. 16.

12. Mahābhārata (Cr. Ed) 1. 70 24, 28.

13. Mahābhārata (Cr. ed) 1. 90. 8–9

14. Pargiter; op. cit., page 145.

personages had to be given new parentages, new events and new traditions through historical jumps. Nahuṣa affords an example of such great jump. Nahusa is a son of Kaśyapa and Kadru.[15] Nahuṣa has also been given the parentage of Āyu, son of Pururavas. The Ṛgveda knows Pururavas, Āyu and Nahuṣa but does not know of any relationship between them. The Rgveda knows Nahuṣa associated with pre-Āryan people as shown later. The assigning of Āyu's fatherhood to Nahuṣa is an abrupt change. Nāga Nahuṣa is elevated as Paurava Nahusa But Paurava had earlier belonged to the Ahi subrace The unravelling of such historical jumps would shed much light in dissipating darkness from real events.

Fifth test of unmaking of transferences and transpositions

Fifthly, the names of perons, places, times and tribes have consciously been intermixed in such a way that the truth remains deposited in deep dark caves. Aiksavāka Trayyāruna is the descendant of Trasadasyu in seventh degree. Viśwāmitrā's father Kuśa, leave apart Gādhi, is contemporary of Vasumata, descendant of Trasadasyu in fourth degree. Viśwāmitra, son of Kuśika,[16] is contemporary of Sudās and Purukutsa, father of Trasadasyu in the Rgveda The Ṛgvedic Purukutsa is a Pūru who is also spoken of as an Aiksavāka in Śatapatha Brāhmana. The synchronism of Trayyāruna, Viśwāmitra's father Gādhi, Jamadagni's grandfather Urva and Arjuna's father Kṛtavīrya given by Pargiter appears to be unfounded The Rgveda does not know any branch of the Yadus, the Haihayas or the Satvants. Only undivided Yadus are known to the Rgveda. The Purānas have unscrupulously jumbled these names.

Various synchronisms with Sagara are still more interesting. Sagara is made contemporary of Kāśi King Pratardana son of Divodāsa II but Divodāsa also later appears in North Pāñchāla line. Sagara is contemporary of Turvaśa Marutta and one degree lower to Marutta Vaiśāla. Turvaśas populated Punjab while the Vaiśālas populated north Bihar. Paurava

15. Mahābhārata (Cr. ed) 1. 31. 9.

16. Ṛgveda 3. 3. 4. 5.

Duṣyanta is two degrees lower to Sagara and contemporary of Kakṣivant, son of Dirghatamas. Kakṣivant[17] and Dirghatamas[18] appear in the Rgveda Kakṣivant is contemporary of Kutsa[19] who is contemporary of Divodāsa Atithigva.[20] Divodāsa is separated from Sagara by twentytwo degrees. Turvaśa Marutta's Punjab is separated by thousands of miles from Vaiśāla Marutta's Vaiśāli (North Bihar). The Ahi, the Ikṣvāku and the Brahmāryan races have ingeniously been intermixed. This paurānic way has covered the reality and mixed up together the contrary elements which have to be sifted from each other.

Dauṣyanti Bharata is said to have seized the sacrificial horse of Satvants.[21] Satvant son of Madhu is contemporary of Rāma, son of Daśaratha Aśvapati Kaikeya is contemporary of Rāma. Satvants are unknown to the Rgveda Śatapatha Brāhmana was composed in the sixth or seventh century B. C. after the compositon of the Rgvedic Aitareya and Kausitaki Brāhmanas [22] Satvants, hence, come into existence between 1000-700 B. C. Aśvapati Kaikeya is mentioned in Śatapatha Brāhmana and Chhāndogya Upaniṣad.[23] He is contemporary of Uddālaka Āruni of the Upanisadic fame who flourished in the seventh century B C [24] Here the confusion has been created between two Bharatas, two Aśvapatis Persons of long antiquity have been mixed up with comparatively persons of later age Sindh-Punjab region has been mixed up with the Uttarapradesa region. Ānava King Bāli is called a Dānava.

17 Ṛgveda 1. 5. 1. 1; 1. 18. 6. 2, 3, 4, 1. 16. 7 11.

18. Ṛgveda 1. 22. 2 6, 8. 2. 4. 10.

19. Ṛgveda 4. 3. 5 1

20. Ṛgveda 1. 10. 3 10, 2. 2. 3. 7

21. Śatapatha Brāhmana 13. 5. 4 9, 21.

22. A. A. Macdonell; A History of Sanskrit Literature, 1958; page 202–203

23. (1) Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 10. 6. 1. 2.
(2) Chhāndogya Upaniṣad 5. 11. 4.

24. H. C. Roychowdhari, Political History of Ancient India 1950; pages 52, 56.

Pargiter calls it a confusion of different persons of the same name.[25] But really this is no confusion. Pargiter did not pay due attention to reactions and interactions of the two races, the Brahmāryan and the Ahi races, upon each other. Ānvas belonged to pre-Āryan Ahi sub-race. Ahis are called Daityas and Dānavas. When the converted Ānvas twisted their history, Bāli Vairochana became Ānava Bāli and a confusion was sought to be created that two were two different persons But Ānava Bāli and Dānava Bāli are one and the same person. This is a case of the intermixture of two hostile tribes. Truth dawns through the dialectical interpretation of history.

Sixth test of severance of mythology and history.

Sixthly, the mythology has been converted into history and history has been mythologised. Manu and Iḍā afford the instances of the former, Indra, Brahaspati and other Brahmāryan leaders, the instances of the latter.

The word Manu has been used in the Ṛgveda in the general sense of man or mankind. But it has also been used for a proper person Manu is a new Brahmāryan leader. He does not belong to the hierarchy of old Āryan leaders (Devas).[26] Manu like other Āryan Devas, is the leader of men.[27] Manu drinks soma and is triumphant over the Dasyus.[28] Viśvedevas helped Manu to achieve victory against his adversaries.[29] Indra is Manu[30] Manu overcame his noseless enemies.[31] After the Brahmāryan victory in Dāśarājña war, Manu rose to still more prominence. He was the main agency in ritualising the institution of Yajña. He instituted ritualised Yajña.[32]

25. Pargiter, op cit; pages 63, 64.
26. Ṛgveda 1. 20. 6. 9.
27. Ṛgveda 10. 5. 2. 11
28. Ṛgveda 9. 5. 7. 5.
29. Ṛgveda 6. 2 6. 11.
30. Ṛgveda 4. 3. 5. 1.
31. Ṛgveda 5. 4. 1. 6
32. Ṛgveda 10. 4. 9. 5.

He appointed Agni to be the invoker of gods, the most wise bearer of oblations.[33] Manu then, becomes father and progenitor.[34] This Manu like Indra and Bṛhaspati does not appear in association with or as an adversary of any historical personage like Divodāsa, Sudās and Vaśiṣtha or Śambara, Viśwāmitra and Purukutsa. He is throughout in the Rgveda a pure mythical being. This mythical Manu is further celestialised in the Anukramanī age circa 500-200 B C.[35] Manu becomes the son of Vivasvān Āditya or Samvarna or Apsu. Manu is assigned the revelation of several Rgvedic hymns in the last three Maṇḍals This son of sun is made the mythical father of Ikṣvāku and his nine brothers, Iksvāku, Nābhāga, Śaryāta and Nābhānedistha are mentioned in the Ṛgveda but they have not been given the fatherhood of Manu. By the time of the Anukramaṇī tradition, only Śaryata and Nābhānediṣṭha got Manu's fatherhood but the rest still were not regarded as his progeny. Manusmrti does not know nine of his ten sons It knows only his daugther Ilā [36] It knows Manu only as inventor of the sacrificial rites,[37] not the progenitor of various tribes. He is given the fatherhood of various tribes in the Gupta age when some of the Purānas took their present form.

The problem of Manu's son or daughter Ilā is simpler. The Ṛgveda does not know of any Ilā, daughter or son of Manu. Ilā of the Ṛgveda has Daksa as her father. [38] Ilā is a goddess along with Saraswatī and Mahī. [39] She is the protector of and participator in sacrificial rites. [40] Ilā is Vāk [41] Ilā is

33. Rgveda 6 2. 1. 9, 8 3. 7. 24, 8. 3 7. 21, 7. 1. 2. 3, 10. 6. 1 3, 10. 5. 3. 7.

34 Ṛgveda 1 16 9 2, 87 4. 1

35. A. A. Macdonell; op cit., pages 39, 244, 373.

36. George Buhlar, The Laws of Manu, 1886; page LVIII.

37. George Buhlar, op. cit., page LIX.

38 Ṛgveda 3. 2. 15 10

39. Ṛgveda 1. 4 3. 9, 1. 21. 3. 9, 5. 1. 5. 8

40. Ṛgveda 2. 1. 3. 8; 3. 1 4. 8, 7 1. 2. 8; 9. 1. 5 8; 1. 24 9. 8; 7. 3. 11. 2

41. Ṛgveda 3. 1. 7. 5.

Earth.[42] Ilā is food,[43] productive of descendants.[44] Ilā is cattle.[45] Ilā is milk.[46] Ilā is attended by brave warriors, inflicting much injury, receiving none.[47] Ilā is butter-handed.[48] Ilā is altar[49] Ilā is mother of the herd, and Urvasi,[50] Agni is Ilā of hundred winters.[51] Agni is placed upon the earth in the centre, in the place of Ilā.[52] Ilā is born of wood, of attrition and dissipates darkness. Agni is Ilā's bright blazing son.[53] This description of Ilā equates her with the material wealth of the Āryan Gaṇa or Brahma. The Rgveda gives her association with Manu but not as his son or daughter She is the instructress of Manu.[54]

The above description of Ilā establishes that they have nothing to do with origin of any human race. The origin of Solar and Lunar races from them is a pure Brāhmaṇic fabrication to cover the truth of the pre-Āryan and non-Āryan origins of the races of their converts who swelled up their ranks. We do not hear of any Solar or Lunar race before the Purāṇic age, i.e the early centuries of the Christian era. The banishment from history of Manu and Ilā, the pure myths, as the progenitors of races and tribes would help us in discovering the truths about them

Indra and Bṛhaspati, the two of the most important Brahmāryan military leaders are real human beings in the Ṛgveda.

42. Ṛgveda 3 1. 1. 23; 3. 1. 5. 11, 3. 1. 6. 11; 3. 1. 7. 11, 3 2. 3. 7, 3. 2. 10. 5, 3 2. 11. 5, 4. 5. 5. 8; 5. 5. 6. 5. 6.

43. Ṛgveda 5. 4. 9. 2; 6. 1. 10. 7, 7 1. 3. 7, 7. 4. 10. 4; 7. 4. 9 2; 8. 5. 1. 4; 9. 3. 2 3; 9. 7. 5, 13.

44. Ṛgveda 6. 5. 3. 16.

45. Ṛgveda 1. 9. 5. 16.

46. Ṛgveda 7. 1. 3. 7.

47. Ṛgveda 1. 8. 5. 4.

48. Ṛgveda 7. 1. 16 8.

49. 1. 19. 2. 7, 3. 2. 12. 2.

50. Ṛgveda 5. 3. 9. 19.

51. Ṛgveda 2. 1. 1. 11.

52. Ṛgveda 3. 2. 17. 4.

53. Ṛgveda 3. 2. 17. 3.

54. Ṛgveda 1. 7. 1. 11.

We may leave aside their wars with Vrtras and Paṇis but their associations with Divodāsa, Sudās, Kṛṣṇa and other important historical personages who played important historical roles in Āryo-Bhārata wars makes them important historical personalities. The Rgveda is full of such historical human feats of Indra and Bṛhaspati. These human beings were later celestialised. History was mythologised. We will go into the reasons of mytholisation of history later.

Seventh test of acceptability of common traditions

Seventhly, the statements of events common to Brāhmaṇical, neo-Bhāratīya, Jaina and Buddhist traditions should generally be accepted. Rsabha, Bharata and Nemi are accepted as historical persons in Brāhmanical and Jaina traditions. Sagara is accepted by all the three traditions. Viśwāmitra, Jamadagni Māndhātṛ, Uśīnara, Śivi, Dilīpa, Muchukunda, Bhagīratha, Aśtaka, Dhṛtarāstra, and Uparichra are accepted by the Brāhmanical and Buddhist traditions. Daśaratha, Rāma, and Sītā, Haryaśva and Krṣna are accepted by all the three traditions. Iksvāku, as the most important race of Bhārata, is accepted by all the three traditions. All the traditions unanimously agree that Ayodhyā was the most ancient city.

These tests shall help us in analysing the nature of the races and their component tribes It is of greet historical significance to know as to which race or tribe is Brahmāryan and which race or tribe is pre-Āryan and Bhāratīyan. The knowledge about the truth of the Bhāratīya and Brahmāryan races and their traditions would help us much in unravelling the numerous knotty problems of history of the later ages.

CHAPTER II

THE IKṢVĀKU RACE

1. THE ORIGINAL RACE

Neo-Bhāratīya Tradition

The neo-Bhāratīya tradition holds that Ikṣvāku had one hundred sons, chief of whom were Vikukṣi, Nimi and Daṇḍa (or Dandaka). Vikuksi succeeded Iksvāku and reigned at Ayodhyā. Nimi established his dynasty at Videha. Daṇḍaka named the great Dandaka forest after his name. Ikṣvāku's fifty sons under Śakuni ruled over Uttarāpatha (Northern India) and his rest forty-eight sons under Vaśāti were the rulers of Daksināpatha (the Deccan or Southern India). Ikṣvākus occupied the whole of Bhārata [1]

Jaina Tradition

The Jaina tradition maintains that Ṛṣabha son of Nābhi was the first social leader who gave law to the people. He was the progenitor of the Iksvāku race. [2] He ruled at Ayodhyā. The Jaina tradition knows only two races; the Ikṣvāku race and the Hari race. The twentytwo out of twentyfour Jaina Tīrthamkaras belong to the Ikṣvāku race; only two to the Hari race. Ṛṣabha and his son Bharata ruled over the whole of Bhārata. The neo-Bhāratīya tradition also corroborates this Jaina tradition. Nābhi was the sole ruler of Ajanābhakhaṇḍa [3] or Himavarṣa. [4] His son Ṛṣabha ruled over the whole of his father's country. His son Bharata gave his name to Ajanabhakhaṇḍa or Himavarsa as Bhārata. [5] Most of the Purāṇas maintain that Bharata son of Ṛṣabha

---

1 Pargiter; op. cit; pages 257, 288, 292.

2. Helen M Johnson; Triśaṣtiśalākā Puruṣacharita, Vol I page 132.

3. Bhāgawata Purāṇa (Gita Press) 5. 2. 19.

4. Viṣṇu Purāṇa 2. 1. 15–22.

5. (1) Bhāgawata Purāna 5. 4. 9.
   (2) Viṣṇu Purāṇa 2. 1. 32.

gave Himavant country his name [6] Ṛṣabha and Bharata appeared before Vaivsavata Manu's age. The neo-Bhāratīya tradition, thus, places the progenitor of the Ikṣvāku race before Manu, the father of Iksvāku who is said to have originated the race of his own name.

Buddhist Tradition

The Buddhist tradition traces the origin of the Śākyas to one Okkāka who is identified with Ikṣvāku.[7] Buddhist tradition is in live with the Jaina and neo-Bhāratīya traditions. All acclaim that Iksvāku was a great race continuing through history since unknown antiquity.

Vedic Evidence

The earliest literary evidence of the Iksvāku race appears in the Rgveda. King Iksvāku a great protector, protects the five territories of the Pañchajanāh [8] Pañchajanāḥ were non-sacrificing pre-Aryan non-Āryan Bhāratīya people. They were Pūrus, Yadus, Turvaśas, Anus and the Druhyus.[9] They along with the other Ahi tribes took part in the Dāśarājña war against Sudās and Indra. The earliest reference of the Iksvākus in the Rgveda associates them with the anti-Brāhmaryan forces

The Atharvaveda mentions the association of Kuṣṭha disease with the Iksvākus of old along with its associations with Vāyasa and Matsya.[10] Matsya was a pre-Āryan non-Āryan Bhāratīya tribe of the Ahi race. Vāyasa was a prince of olden times.[11] Vāyasa is associated with Suparna.[12] Suparna is son of Kaśyapa from his wife Muni or Prādhā.[13]

6. H. C. Roychowdhari, Studies in Indian Antiquities, 1958; page 76.
7. B. C. Law, The Tribes of Ancient India, 1943, page 245.
8. Rgveda 10. 4. 18 4.
9. R. C. Jain, The Most Ancient Āryan Seciety; 1964; page 29.
10. Atharvaveda 19. 39. 9.
11. Ralph. T H. Griffith; The Hymns of the Atharvaveda; 1917; page 297.
12. Ṛgveda 1 22. 8 52.
13. Mahābhārata (Cr. ed.) 1. 59. 41; 1. 59. 45.

He is the brother of Mayūra, Asura the Great.[14] Kaśyapa was the progenitor of the non-Āryan Ahi people.[15] Vāyasa was a non-Āryan Asura prince. Here also Ikṣvākus appear along with Ahi tribes.

The Ṛgveda mentions an Aiksavāka Trayāruna, son of Trivṛṣṇa who has been identified with Trayāruṇa son of Tridhanvan and with Trayāruna Trasadasyu.[16] Trasadasyu, the Pūru, is the son of Purukutsa who was an Aikṣavāka.[17] Trasadasyu was born after the conclusion of the Dāśarājña war. Ikṣvāku Trayāruna must have flourished in the beginning of the eleventh century B. C Trayāruna's chariot ran over a Brāhmaṇa child who lost his life.[18] Ikṣvākus had not come under the Bāhmanical influence even during the later part of the second millenium B. C.

Purukutsa and Trasadasyu

Purukutsa and his son Trasadasyu are Iksvākus according to all the Purānas But the Rgveda represents them as the Pūrus.[19] Purukutsa, the Pūru is also an Aikṣavāka. Pūrus have also been referred as Asura-Rāksasas.[20] The association of Asura Pūrus with Asura Ahis in the Rgvedic times is very significant. the Yadus were related to the Pūru Asuras.[21] The Yadus descended from Pūru-Iksvāku blood or Ahi-Iksvāku blood. The Yadus and the Turvaśas are treated as Dāsas in the Ṛgveda.[22] The Anus[23] and the Druhyus[24] are Mlechchhas. But the Yadus are also given to have sprung from the

14. Mahābhārata (Cr. ed.) 1. 61. 33. 34.
15. Mahābhārata (Cr. Ed) 1. 159. 40.
16. A. A. Macdonell and A. B. Keith; Vedic Index; 1958; Vol. I page 75.
17. Śatapatha Brāhmana 13 5. 4. 5.
18. Pañchavimśa Brāhmaṇa 13. 3. 12.
19. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 2. 3.
20. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 6. 8. 1. 14.
21. A. Banerjee Shastri; Asura India, 1926, page 82.
22. Ṛgveda 10. 5. 2. 10.
23. Mahābhārata (Cr. ed.) 1. 80. 26.
24. B. C. Law, Tribes in Ancient India, 1943; page 12.

daughter of Dānava Madhu and Ikṣvāku Haryaśva. The Yadus, thus, may claim their descent from Iksvākus. The Kekayas, the descendants of non-Āryan Ānvas, even in historical period had matrimonial alliance with the Ikṣvākus. [25] These Daityas, Dānavas and Rāksasas are known as Ahi people in the Ṛgveda. They were the spearhead and backbone of the Bhāratiyan resistance to the Brahmāryan invaders. The whole of western Bhārata comprising Iran, Arachosia, Gedrosia, Kaśmīra, Sindh and Punjab was populated by the people who were either Aiksvākas or closely allied to Aiksvākas

Prāchya Ikṣvākus

The Brahmāryans had finally settled in their new colony of Brahmāvarta by 1000 B. C. They consolidated their power by that time. They then advanced towards the east and brahmanized eastern parts of Bhārata as far as Videha and Anga circa 900 B. C They could brahmanise south Bihar and Bengal by the middle of the third century A. D which represents practically the last period when the original Purāna was recast The east was populated by the peoples of Kāśi and Kośala, the Lichchhavis and Mallas. They all belonged to the Ikṣvāku race. [26] The people of Videha were of the Iksvāku descent. The Vaiśāli people were also predominantly Aiksvāka. [27] The Iksvākus had occupied the whole of Eastern India with whom the Brahmāryans had to contend with for political supremacy in the first part of the first millenium B. C. [28]

We do not know much about the Deccan people in this age. Aitareya Brahmana informs us that the Dasyu descendants of Viśwāmitra populated the far eastern and southern Bhārata. [29] The descent of Viśwāmitra family is traced to

25. B. C. Law, *op. cit.* p. 77.

26. B C Law op. cit pages 56, 109, 298, 299.

27. Yogendra Misra, An Farly History of Vaiśāli, 1962, page 115.

28. D. R Bhandarkar, Āryan Immigration into Eastern India, A. B. O. R. I. Vol. 12 pages 111-118.

29. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 8, 22.

the Pūrus as we later see. Thus we find that at the time of Āryan penetration of India; the whole of Bhārata was populated by the Ikṣvākus and their branches.

Pūru versus Ikṣvāku

The close association of the Ikṣvākus and the Pūrus has led to the erroneous view that the Ikṣvākus were originally a branch of the Pūrus. [30] The internal evidence of the Purāṇas do not lead to any such conclusion. The Vedic evidence makes the Pūru warriors as Aiksvākus. The Purānic evidence glorofies the Ikṣvākus more than the Pūrus. The Pūrus identified themselves with the Iksākus and adopted the name Ikṣvāku to themselves. This certainly makes the Pūrus a branch of the Iksvākus.

The Rgveda distinctly mentions that the Pūrus were settled on both the banks of Saraswatī along with other constituents of Pañchajanāḥ [31] The Pūrus lived on the upper parts of Saraswatī. The Purānic tradition maintains that Prāchinvant, a Pūru scion, marched towards the east. Iksvāku Kuvalāśva killed Dānava Dhundhu. He is equated with Sudhanvān, the descendant of Prāchinvant. Dhundhu is a Dānava as well as Pūru and the marriage of his sister with Ikṣvāku Haryaśva fructified in the birth of Yadu who originated the Yadu line. These salient facts go to establish the supremacy of the Ikṣvāku race.

Ikṣvākus are not Dravidians

The Ikṣvākus was the great pre-Āryan Bhāratīya race. Pargiter has tried to establish that the Ikṣvākus should be equated with Dravidians. [32] The Purāṇas do not know any Draviḍa tribe. It appears that the Dravidians had not gained any importance by the Purāṇic age circa 300 A. D. The Purāṇas give a preface which throws much light upon the

30. E. J. Rapson; The cambridge History of India; Vol. I. chapter XIII the Purāṇas, 1955; page 276.

31. Ṛgveda 6. 5. 12. 12.

32. Pargiter; op. cit.; page 296.

nature of the various tribes. The preface asserts that Āndhras, Śakas, Pulindas, Chūlikas Yavanas, Kaivartas, Ābhīras, Śavaras and others are of Mlechchha origin. Pauravas, Vitihotras, Vaidiśas, Five Kośalas (Pāñchālas), Mekalas, Kośalas (Mahākośala), Paundras, Gaunardas, Svasphras,[33] Sunidharmas, Śakas, Nipas and others will be of Mlechchha race. This catalogue obviously includes in itself various Iksvāku, the Pūru, Yadu and some Ahi tribes The descendants of, Ikṣvākus, and Ilā are spoken of as non-Āryans. This clearly establishes the mythic character of Manu and Ilā The Ailas and the Ikṣvākus still reamin non-Āryan Mlechchhas in the Pūranas circa 300 A. D.

The Āryans despised Vrātyas. Bhūrjakanṭaka, Āvantya, Vāṭadhāna, Puṣpadha, Śesa, Jhalla, Malla, Lichchhavi, Naṭa, Karana, Khasa, Dravida, Sudhanvan, Kārusā, Vijanman, and Sātvata, are termed as Vrātyas. Sūta, Vaidehaka, Māgadha, Ksatri, and Āyogava and placed along with Chandalas.[34] Here also the Ikṣvāku, the Pūru and Ahi tribes have been mentioned as degraded people The Dravida caste is mentioned separately but is not so important that it may be called a race constituted of many tribes. Pargiter may be partially right in his conclusion that in the Purānas, three different myths have been blended together in an attempt to unify the origins of the three different dominant races.. ... constituting three separate stocks.[35] But he has not adduced any evidence to prove that the Dravidians existed in Bhārata before the Āryan invasions. He has also failed to unearth any Dravidian tradition to prove that the Mānavas or Ikṣvākus were Dravidians. He would have been nearer to truth if he had propounded the theory that in the Purānas, two different myths, the Brahmāryan and the Bhāratīyan have been blended together in an attempt to unify the origins of the two different dominant races of Bhārata in their coalesced state.

---

33. F. E. Pargiter; The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age, 1967; pages 2, 67.

34. Manusmrti, 10. 21. 23, 26.

35. Pargiter; op. cit. (A. I. H. T.) page 288.

When the Brahmāryans invaded Bhārata, there were no Dravidians inhabiting the land of Bhārata. The whole of Bhārata was populated by the Proto-Australoids.[36] These Proto-Australoids had named the various regions of their land as Kośala-Tośala, Aṅga-Vanga Kalinga-Tilinga, Mekala-Utkala, Pulinda-Kulinda (with the group Uḍra-Puṇḍa-Muṇda), Bhuliṅga, Sālvas, Kamboja and Tāmralinga. These words do not belong to the families of Indo-European or Dravidian languages. They are characteristic of the vast family of languages which are called Austro-Asiatic and which covers in India the group of Muṇḍā languages, often called also the Kolarian.[37] Purāṇas give the twisted versions of these Proto-Australoid traditions.

Ikṣvākus are Proto-Australoids

The gourd myth is prominently an Austro-Asiatic myth. Several Austro-Asiatic people call themselves issues either of a gourd or a melon of which every seed gave birth to a man. The same myth has passed to the Indian tradition. The wife of Sagara, King of Ayodhyā, named Sumati to whom 60000 sons were promised, gave birth to a gourd from which 60000 children came out.[38] Jaina tradition places Sagara in remoter antiquity than the Brāhmaṇic tradition. He is the second chakravartin just after Bharata. The transposition of the legend to Sagara proves its still prior antiquity. This gourd myth, prior to Sagara, was current in Ṛṣabha's age. The Sanskrit word for gourd is Ikṣvāku. The existence of the gourd myth in Ṛṣabha's times proves him to be a Proto-Australoid scion. The tradition of Rāma and Sitā also belong to the proto-Australoid age. The whole of Bhārata at the time of Brahmāryan invasions was populated by people known as Proto-Australoids to the anthropologists and as the Ikṣvākus to the historians. We may safely identify the Ikṣvākus with the Proto-Australoids. Great heroes of India ; Ṛsabha, Bharata,

36. R. C. Jain, The Most Ancient Āryan Society; 1964; Chapter III section 6.

37. Sylvain Levi & others; The Pre-Āryan and Pre-Dravidian in India, 1929, page 95.

38. Sylvain Levi; op. cit.; page 164.

Sagara, Rāma and host of others belonged to the Proto-Australoid ethnic stock.

Ikṣvāku Domain

The Ikṣvāku race at one stage of history dominated the whole of Bhārata. It is only later, in the first part of third millenuim B. C. that the Ahi sub-race of the Iksvāku race, became prominent in western Bhārata which later migrated to eastern Bhārata after their crushing defeat in the Dāśarājña War. The domain of the Ikṣvākus may further be traced beyound the frontiers of Iran, the Far Western province of Bhārata, in Babylonia. In the language of Assyria, the word for a vassal is "Iśākku" and the Assyrians in the initial stages of their political development acted as the "Iśākkus" or vassals of the Babylonian kings. The Iśākkus have been identified with the Iksvākus Ekwesh or Akauśa people of Egypt and the Greek Akhaioi have also been identified with Ikṣvākus [39] These identifications can not be carried too far. The existence of the Ikṣvākus in the Assyrian ethnic stock appears very probable. The name might have travelled to Egypt and Greece also. The Iksvāku Panis referred as Ahis in the Rgveda carried the Nagna or Śramanic culture of Bhārata to distant lands of Sumer, Egypt and the Mediterianean in the fourth millenium B. C. Nagnas, as shown later, were associated with the conception of Ahi or serpant; serpant being a dominant art motif in the material relics of Bhārata, Sumer, Egypt and Crete. The first Mediterranean immigration to Bhārata, took place in the first part of the third millenium B. C, Ahi sub race of the Ikṣvāku race had by that time gained more prominence and established supremacy in the western regions of Bhārata.

All this foregoing discussion conclusively proves that the Ikṣvāku race was the sole race that populated Bhārata since immemorial antiquity. It was at some stage in the heary past that its Ahi sub-race separated from it though it gratefully remembered its lineage from the Iksvāku even in the historical times. The other important tribes; the Pūrus, the Yadus and others; traced their origins either to the main Ikṣvāku stock

39. Buddhprakash; Vṛtra; A. B. O. R. I. Vol. 32 page 178.

or to the Ahi stock. The Iksvāku race was the pre-Āryan non-Āryan Bhāratīya race.

2. THE BHARATAS

Bharata Problem

Sylvain Levi has rightly observed that India has been too exclusively examined from the Indo-European stand point. [40] Like the Europāryan brother scholars, Brahmāryan scholars have also too exclusively examined the life and culture of Bhārata. An exclusive view gives only the partial truth from which arise various ambiguities and absurdities. Rgvedic Bharatas are a case in point. They played the most important part in the Dāśarājña War. Who were they ? Whether they were the conquering Brahmāryans or the conquered Bhāratīyans, has been much debated. Prejudices have played no less important part in up-holding one view or the other.

Bharatas in the Rgveda

Bharatas are alluded to in the Ṛgveda only once going to war under the leadership of Viśvāmitra. Bharata troops came to the jointstream of the Vipāś and the Śutudrī which they crossed over. [41] During the times of the Dāśarājña war at about 1150 B.C. The Beas and Satluj ran in parallel beds for a long distance below their present junction. [42] The ancient junction would be some where North East of Harappa to the East of the Ravi (Vedic-Paruṣṇī) but not far from it. The joint stream might have been a little below the junction of the two rivers opposite Harappa which was crossed over by the Bharata forces. After crossing the joint stream, the Bharatas advanced West to the town of Hariyupīya situate East of the Paruṣṇī where a constituent of Bharatas the Vṛchivants had complete military preparations for the combat [43] with the Āryan forces. They

40. Sylvain Levi, Pre-Āryan and Pre-Dravidian in India, 1929, page 125.

41. Rgveda 3. 3. 4. 11. 12.

42. M. N. Wadia-Geological Background of Indian History (Vedic Age) 1957, page 93-94.

43. Ṛgveda 6. 3. 4. 5.

joined the military command of Bharatas. Some scholars connect Hariyupīya with Harappa.[44] The Brahmāryan Trtsus lived to the West of the river Paruṣṇi which was made fordable by Indra for a navel battle with the Bharatas.[45] The opposing combatant forces met on the flowing waters of the Paruṣṇi as well as on land. The first battle of the Dāśarājña War was fought very severelly,[46] and the enemies of Sudās, speaking a foreign language, were routed and subjugated.[47]

There is a great divergence among the scholars about the relations of Bharatas and Sudās, the Tṛstu King.[48] Zimmer and Bloomfield hold that Tṛtsus and Bharatas were enemies.[49] Oldenberg and Weber held that Bharatas were victorious with Sudās.[50] Rapson[51] Keith[52] and Filliozat[53] believe Bharatas and Trtsus identical R Shafer holds Bharatas and Trtsus as enemies.[54] Gokhale[55] Pradhan[56] and Macdonell[57] maintain that Bharatas were defeated by Tṛtsus and Sudās

Bharatas appear only in relation to Sudās. They do not at all appear in relation to Divodāsa, the grand-father of Sudās Association of Bharatas with Divodāsa has been wrongly suggested[58] The cause of this confusion is a joint reading

44 Majumdar & others–An Advanced History of India, 1958, Part I. page 26.
45. Rgveda 7. 2. 1. 5.
46. Rgveda 7. 2. 1. 11. 12.
47. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1. 9
48. (1) Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1. 13 & 24.
(2) A A. Macdonell--A History Sanskrit literature, 1958, page 154.
49. Macdonell & Keith-Vedic Indiex, 1958, Vol. II, page 95.
50. Macdonell & Keith, op. cit., Vol I page 321.
51. Rapson--The Cambridge History of India, 1955, page 42.
52. Macdonell & Keith, op. cit, page 73.
53. I Filliozat-Political History of India, 1957, page 94.
54. R. Shafer; Ethnography of Ancient India, 1954; page 29.
55 Gokhale; Ancient India, 1959, page 23.
56. Sitanath Pradhan-Chronology of Ancient India, 1927; page 97.
57. A. A. Macdonell; op cit., (H. S. L.); page 154–155.
58. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 6. 5. 6, 6. 2. 1. 4–5.

of the Ṛgvedic Hymns 6. 2. 1. 4 & 6. 2. 15. These two Hymns are quite independent of each other and one complete hymn does not speak of both the Bharatas and Divodāsa. The first only alludes to Bharatas and stops there. The second refers only to Divodāsa without any relation to Bharatas. Independently interpreted they give the picture of life of two different ages i.e. one of the thirteenth century B. C. and the other of eleventh or tenth century B. C.

This is a queer peice of amalgamation of two different facts of history by the rhapsodist who composed these hymns more than 150 years after the events took place but this is not uncommon with the Brahmāryan rhapsodists who continued this process of falsification of facts till the time of the composition of Mahābhārata in its final form more than 3000 years after-wards. Sukathankara is conscious of this mosaic of old and new matter in the Mahābhārata.[59] This might have been a continuing process, the lead having already been given by the Vedic composer.

When Indra was Commander-in-chief of the Brahmāryan forces during the time of Divodāsa, he waged wars against Dāsas and Dasyus. The Yadus and the Turvaśas also appear in relation to him in certain context but no where the Bharatas. the Bharatas appear only in relation to Sudās. The Ṛgveda does not allude to any defeat of Trtsu Sudās by his enemies nor any loss of territories he had earlier wrongfully usurped or inherited. The interpretation of this hymn RV. 7. 2. 16. 6 accepted by Majumdar and others does not seem convincing.[60] They hold the view that Bharatas were at first admittedly inferior to their foes and were shorn off their possessions which they could not long endure and engaged themselves in deadly struggles against their rivals. Their dealing with the subject shows uncertainty and indecisiveness. They refer to the struggles of the Śṛñjayas with the Turvaśas and Vṛchivants and to the Battle of Ten Rājās without bringing in the Bharatas in

59 Mahābhārata (Cr. Ed); Vol. I. P. CIII.

60. Majumdar & others op. cit.; page 27.

these battles. This is due to their lack of dilectical historical perspective.

Bharatas are not Tṛtsus

We find the Bharatas involved in military conflict only on the banks of Paruṣṇi In the battle, the Druhyus were drowned in the river. Fort of the Anus was annexed and Kavi son of Cha-yamana was killed in ground battle. All the eminent authorities agree that one battle of the Dāsarājña War was fought on the banks of the Parusnī and that the Pūrus, the Anus, the Druhyus, the Yadus, and the Turvasas were definitely the five constituents of the Ten Republics confederacy. This battle indicates the victory of the Trtsus and if Trtsus be deemed identical with Bharatas, then the victory of the Bharatas but the Bharatas were definitely defeated here; therefore they cannot be equated with the Trtsus nor can be treated as their allies but can be explained only as enemies of Trtsus. As some members of Pañchajanāh or Ten Republics Confederacy also fell in this battle, hence they cannot be accepted as hostile to the Bharatas. The view of various scholars, who equate Bharatas with Trtsus, that Bharatas were enemies of the Pūrus and other members of the Confederacy is based on this false assumption and hence clearly untenable.

What, rational interpretation, then, may be given to the Rg-veda 7 2.16 6 The first part of the hymn alludes to the defeat of Bharatas at the hands of Trtsu king Sudās in the first phase of the Dāśarājña War The second part of the hymn refers to the prosperity of the Tṛtsus under the Purohitaship of Vasistha. This was before the Dāśarājña war took place. This is amalgamation, pure and simple, of two different events of history. This again is a glaring illustration of a mosaic of old and new matter.

Joint reading of the Ṛgveda 7.2 16 5 & 7.2.16.6. throws a new and very important light on the present enquiry. The truth of the above thesis quriously but automatically appears in the scheme of the hymn collections. The word "Dāśarājña" does not appear in the actual battle hymn. The aforesaid former hymn speaks of the War of Tṛtsu chief Sudās with the

Ten Rājās. And in the following hymn the defeat and subjugation of the Bharatas is alluded to. Though the Ṛgveda does not give a list of Ten Rājās who formed the Confederacy; various scholars give differing lists. All the scholars include among them the Pūrus, the Yadus, the Turvaśas, the Aṇus and Druhyus, the Ajās, the Shigrus and the Yakṣas, are also included. I would add with them the Vṛchivants and the Matsyas. Some include the Pakthas, Bhalanas, the Alinas, the Viṣāṇins and the Śivas but they have clearly been referred to as friends and allies of Sudās and not as his enemies.[61] Their inclusion in Dāśarājña Confederacy would also take the number of the members of the Confederacy to more than Ten which is unwarranted. Bheda is the personel name of the leader Commanding the forces of the Ajās, the Śigrus, and the Yaksas. The Ten-Members of the confedracy were jana republics of Bhārata. It has been agreed by all the scholars without exception that it was Viśvāmitra who led the Dāśarājña War. They also rightly agree that it was also Viśvāmitra who led the Bharatas But no scholar maintains that Visvāmitra led two battles of the Bhāratiyans against Sudās. And the Rgveda also knows only one war, the Dāśarājña War, in which Sudās was engaged. We do not find Sudās fighting two different wars with Bharatas or Ten Rājās. The conclusion therefore is ir-resistable that Bharatas and the Dāśarājña constituents are one and the same They can rightly be equated. It appears certain from the critical study of all the aspects of the Dāśarājña War that the Bharatas was the collective name of all the constituents of the Dāśarājña Confederacy.

This is clearly borne by the further references in later literature. Bharatas are very prominent in Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. They are the core of the epic poem., Jaya, Bhārata and Mahābhārata. Paṇini knows Bhārata Janpada[62] and Patañjali knows Bhāratas[63] Jayaswal on the authority of Āpastambha, Baudhāyana and Kātyāyana maintains that Bharatas were a

61. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1. 7.

62. V. S. Agarwal. India as known to Panini 1953, page 37.

63. B. N Puri-India in the Time of Patanjali 1957, page 69.

nation.[64] It, therefore, appears almost certain that the Ṛgveda understands by Bharatas the collective name of the peoples inhabiting Bhārata then known to it

The Brahmāryan foreigners, when they first set foot on Bhāratīya soil, came in contact with people who in anthropological parley are termed as Proto-Australoids.[65] They inhabited Indus and Gangetic Valleys. They spoke a speach un-intelligible to them. They have been referred as Vadhrvāchaḥ and Mṛdhrvāchaḥ The reference to their hostile language is made in Śatapatha Brāhmana The enemies of the invading Brahmāryans used the word "HALAYO." This is a non-Dravidian word and this appears to be a word belonging to ancient Prākṛt language now lost to humanity It thus appears that they spoke non-Dravidian language[66] Some of them were later converted to "Āryanism"[67] between 1100 B. C. and 800 B C

It has been urged by some scholars that the Tṛtsus (equating with Bharatas) resided in the Brahmāvarata region, the land between Saraswatī, Apāyā and Dṛṣadvatī and they went West to fight the Dāśarājña War This confusion has occured for not paying heed to the chronological aspect of historical events No doubt they resided in Brahmāvarata region[68] but they did not reside here during or prior to the period of the Dāśarājña War. The Dāśarājña War was followed by an amalgamation of the Tṛtsus and the Bharatas into a single nation wherein the Pūrus also finally merged themselves.[69] It is only after the Brahmāryan Victory in the Dāśarājña War that they advanced towards this region and settled there This region in later times became the most important centre of the growth and junction of the Brahmāryan culture and civilisation.

---

64. K. P. Jayaswal Hindu polity. 1955, page 206.
65. J. Prazyluski-Non-Āryan & Non-Dravidian in India (ibid) page 4.
66. Jules Block. op. cit. (N. A. N. D. T); page 37.
67. S. K. Chatterjee; Vedic Age; 1957, page 154.
68. Ṛgveda 3. 2. 11. 4.
69. Gokhale, op. cit.; page 23.

One piece of evidence from the Rgveda corroborates this fact. And this is a very important piece of evidence. Āryan Agni has been represented as born of Dyaus and Pṛthvī or Tvaṣṭr and Waters. It has been brought into existance by Indra or Indra and Viṣṇu or by the Dawn and is the son of Iḍā. It is the personification of scarificial food. Agni is said to have been born in Heaven and brought down by Mātriśvāna.[70] This description of the conception of Agni receives a realistic touch after the merger of Brahmāryans with Bharatas. The Bharata Agni is not born of Dyaus and Prthvī but is born of Ten-Fingers.[71] This fusion of two different ideologies and ways of life make a world of difference in the development of later thought and life of the Brahmāryan-Bhāratīya coalesced people.

After their defeat in the Dāśarājña war, the Bharatas largely coalesced with the Brahmāryans and accepted their Yājñic way. Two Bhāratas, Devaśravas and Devavāta, churned the powerful and wealth-bestowing Agni.[72] Bharata Agni became undecaying and felicity giving.[73] Bharata-Rsabha Viśvāmitra prayed Indra for the protection of the Bhārata race.[74] The enthusiastic rhapsodist set the first example for the later Paurāṇikas of mixing up different events of different periods of history. Divodāsa never came in contact with the Bharatas but the Bhārata Agni was made the destroyer of the enemies of Divodāsa.[75] Two events of two hundred years apart have been made to appear as one event by the Ṛṣic magic.

Bharatas = People of Bhāratavarṣa

These Ṛgvedic references leave no doubt that the Bhārata race was the sole occupant of Bhāratavarṣa, when the Brahmāryans invaded her. The brunt of the total war fell upon them and

70. A. B. Keith; The Religion and philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads 1925, pages 155–156.
71. Ṛgveda 3. 2. 11. 3.
72. Ṛgveda 3. 2. 11. 2.
73. Ṛgveda 6. 2. 1. 45; 4. 3 6 4.
74. Ṛgveba 3. 4. 15. 12.
75. Ṛgveda 6. 2. 1. 19.

they were utterly routed. Some elements of the Bhārata race made peace with the Brahmāryans, got converted and accepted their way of life The Bhārata race is Pre-Āryan non-Āryan, non-Dravidian; the original master of Bhārata-land.

This account of the Bhārata race leaves no necessity for going into the problem of the origin of the Bhārata race. But this problem has also been made shrouded in mysteries, hence it also needs some clarification.

Bharata, son of Ṛshbha

The neo-Bhāratīya tradition asserts that Rsabha son of Nābhi, was the sole master of Bhārata known as Ajanābhakhanda during his times. He became an ascetic and sponsored a religion of Digambara Munis He did not believe in Āsrama way.[76] He practised austerities in the Āśrama of Pulaha [77] His son Bharata named this Ajanābhakhanda as Bhāratavarsa after his name. [78] The jaina tradition corroborates the fact that Bharata, son of Rsabha, gave his name to this our land. There is no Brahmic or Brāhmanic tradition about this problem.

The Purānas make Dausyanti Bharata also as the progenitor of the Bhārata race He is alleged to have given his name to this land But the Purānas do not tell us the name of Bhāratavarsa before she was given this name by Dauṣyanti Bharata. Dausyanti Bharata performing sacrifices seized the sacrificial horse of the Satvants.[79] Satvants are not known to the Rgveda. They first appear in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. Dauṣyanti Bharata does not appear in the Aitareya Brāhmana[80] but first appears in the Śatapatha Brāhmana. It appears that Dauṣyanti Bharata, if at all, appeared in seventh century B. C and not before. He can not be the progenitor of the Bharatas mentioned in

76. Bhāgavata Purāna 5. 3. 20; 5. 4. 9; 5. 6. 10-12.

77. Viṣṇu Purāna 2 1 32

78. (1) Bhāgwata Purāna 5. 7. 2. 3.

(2) Viṣṇu Purāna 2. 1. 32

79. Śatapatha Brāhmana 13. 5. 4. 11, 21.

80. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 8. 14, 2 25.

the Ṛgveda. Bharatas are the chief people of the Ṛgveda. Bharata, son of Ṛsabha and not Dauṣyanti Bharata gave his name to this country. Śatapatha Brāhmana, first of all, introduces Dausyanti Bharata and gives the epithet Dauṣyanti to Bharata purposely to discriminate the two Bharatas. [81] Some one not liking the idea of a jaina ruler being so exalted, hit upon another Bharata but the majority of the Purānas have not accepted the claim of this Bharata—the son of Duṣyanta. Bharata, son of Ṛsabha, ruled for a very long time in an exemplary manner. This memorable event was immortalised by the country being called after Bharata. It seems beyond question that India got its original name after a Jaina prophet. [82]

Ṛsabha-Father of Ikṣvāku race

Rsabha is the orginator of the Śramanic way. The Āryan way as depicted by the Vedic literature is a materialistic way, opposed to the Śramanic way. The Śramanic way of Bhārata and other allied regions is certainly pre-Āryan. [83] The association of Ṛṣabha with Dānava Pulaha in the Brāhmanic literature leaves no doubt that Rsabha was pre-Āryan Bhāratīya certainly not descended from mythical Manu. He was the progenitor of that great race whom the Brahmāryans called Iksvākus and later dubbed as Asuras.

Ikṣvāku is the great race that populated Bhārata before the Brahmāryan military invasions Bhārata is not the name of a race but designates the territoriality of the country. The inhabitants of the country may sometimes be identified with the country itself and it is only in this sense that we have to understand the Bhārata race. Bhārata race means Ikṣvāku race. Bharata-Ṛsabha means Ikṣvāku-Ṛṣabha; i.e. the greatest Ikṣvāku. Bhārata in the pre-Āryan times, was the land of the great Ikṣvāku race

---

81. C. V. Vaidya; The Solar and Lunar Kṣatriya races of India in the Vedas; I. B. B. R. A. S.; Vol. 23 pages 39, 41, 58.

82. R. D. Karmarkar; The Original name of India; A. B. O. R. I. Vol. 36 page 118.

83. R. C. Jain; The Most Ancient Āryan Society, 1964; chapters I & II.

CHAPTER III

THE AHI SUB-RACE

1. THE ORIGIN

Ahi problem

The Ahi people are very prominently mentioned in the Ṛgveda. Indra is the most prominent Brahmāryan hero in the Ṛgveda, so is the great Bhāratīyan hero, Vrtra. The Rgveda really is the historical record of Indra-Vrtra battles. And Vrtra was an Ahi and the greatest Ahi The Iksvāku race does not figure prominently in the Ṛgveda but Ahi, though a sub-race of the Iksvāku race, figures as a race in the Rgveda and certainly more prominently than the Iksvāku race. The Iksvāku race gains historical importance in the Rgvedic age only through its Ahi sub-race, The problem arises; who are the Ahis ? How they have originated ?

Kaśyapa—the progenitor of Ahis

One Daksa, before the age of Purānic Manu Vaivasvata, had only two daughters in Satyayuga They were Vinatā and Kadru who were married to Kaśyapa, [1] Vinatā gave birth to Aristanemi and other four sons. Kadru gave birth to Ahis; Śeṣa, Ananta, Vāsuki and others.[2] The Purānic tradition also declares that Marichi begot a son, the prajāpati Aristanemi who afterwards became Kaśyapa. [3] All the Purāṇas unanimously declare Marichi to be the father of Kaśyapa. Ariṣṭanemi, then, and his brothers born of his mother Vinatā, can not be the sons of Kaśyapa. It appears that the name of Ariṣṭanemi and his brothers have been fabricated to gloss the reality as Ariṣṭanemi son of Marichi is none else than the progentior of the Ahis, the celebrated Kaśyapa himself. Kaśyapa was married to Kālakā and Pulomā, daughters of Asura

1. Mahābhārata (Cr. Ed.); 1. 14. 5. 6.
2. Mahābhārata (Cr. Ed.); 1. 59. 39. 40.
3. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit.; page 189.

Vaiśvānara who bore him sixty thousand Dānavas.[4] The epithet Asura was given to the Dānavas, Daityas and Rakṣas of the Ahi race later. Earlier the Asuras were the kinsmen of the Āryan Devas; themselves the former Devas. Kaśyapa, therefore, appears to be a Dānava and son of a Dānava. Kaśyapa, son of Marichi, is pure and simple, the progenitor of the Ahi race.

Marichi in Jaina tradition

Jaina tradition gives an interesting story of Marichi. Ṛsabha and Sumaṅgalā were born as twins, a pair of son and daughter who became husband and wife when they came of age. One such twin lost the male counterpart, for the first time, in Rsabha's times. The remaining female twin was named Sunandā by her parents. She was married to Ṛsabha.[5] Twin system of sexual union was then discontinued by Ṛsabha. Sumangalā bore Bharata and Brāhmī and Sunandā, bore Bāhubali and Sundarī.[6] Rsabha gave Brāhmī to Bāhubali and Sundarī to Bharata in marriage,[7] their half brothers only, not to their real brothers, Marichi was son of Bharata. He founded a heretic Dharma.[8] Ajita, the second Tīrthaṁkara married hundreds of magnificent royal maidens.[9]

Ṛsabha had discontinued twin unions and the boys and girls of different families had begun to be given in marriage in other families. Woman, so far, was the equal partner of man but now her social position was dwindling and she was fast becoming only the junior partner of man. Some social system for maintaining the social status of women as equal partners of men had to be evolved. Marichi came to disagree with Ṛṣabha. Jaina tradition stops there. It does not associates Marichi with any social system for womanhood.

---

4. D. R. Bhandarkar; Āryan Immigration into Eastern India A. B. O. R. I. Vol. 12 page 108.
5. Helen. M. Johnson; Triśaṣtiśalākā-puruṣacharita; 1931 Vol. I. pages 132, 138, 145.
6. Heln. M. Johnson; op. cit.; Vol. I. page 148.
7. Helen. M. Johnson; op. cit.; Vol. I. pages 154–155 Note 202.
8. Helen. M. Johnson; op. cit.; Vol. I page 330.
9. Helen. M. Johnson; op. cit.; 1937; Vol. II. page 73.

Origin of Matriarchy

The neo-Bhāratīya tradition supplies the lacuna. Dānava Kaśyapa son of Marichi becomes the progenitor of Ahi race not to immortalise his own name. He immortalised the name of his wife Kadru. Her sons were called Kādraveyas. Arbuda Kādraveya is the Rsi of Sūkta 10. 8. 4 of the Tenth Maṇḍala of the Ṛgveda. Kaśyapa was not only the progenitor of Ahi race but also the founder of the Matriarchal system of society. Ṛṣabha was the founder of the Iksvāku race. Marichi was an Aikṣvāka. His son Kaśyapa was an Aiksvāka. Ahi race, thus, is only a branch of the Iksvāku race. Purukutsa is called a Rāksasa and an Aiksvāka. This only means that Purukutsa belonged to the Ahi branch of the Iksvāku race. The Ahi branch is called a race simply because it assumed as much greatness and importance as the Iksvāku race enjoyed. A suggestion, in some quarters, has been made that Ikṣvāku race was a branch of the Pūrus.[10] The scholars who hold this view really did not consider the Pūru problem in the light of the pre-Āryan society They did not pay sufficient attention to the association of Pūrus with Dāsas, Dasyus, Vṛtras, Dānavas and Ahis. Purukutsa is called an Aiksvāka belonging to the Iksvāku race; not a Paurava, belonging to the Pūru tribe. The truth reveals itself in the other way Pūrus are a branch of the Iksvāku race

Later on, some group belonging to the Ahi race assumed the proper name of Kaśyapa. We find mention of Kaśyapa,[11] and Kadru[12] in the Rgveda Ṛsi Kaśyapa is said to have adored Soma. Kadru is a priest offering soma to Indra. Kaśyapa and Kadru have no relationship in the Rgveda. We do not know of any Kaśyapa Jana or people in the Rgveda. The Kaśyapas begin to appear in the Brāhmana period. Though Kaśyapa Mārīcha is the Ṛṣi of many sūktas in the Ṛgveda, specially of the

10. (1) E. J. Rapson; The Purāṇas, The Cambridge History of India, 1955; page 275.

(2) Macdonell and Keith, Vedic Index; 1958; Vol. I. page 75.

11. Ṛgveda 9. 7. 2. 11.

12. Ṛgveda 8. 6. 3. 26.

Ninth Maṇḍala, they were not viewed with favour by the Brāhmaṇa priests. Some of the Kaśyapas had been assimilated by the Brahamāryan society, but still they were not permitted to partake in sacrifices. Janamejaya Pārīkṣita excluded Kaśyapas from Yajña.[13] Kaśyapas are mentioned with Syāparnas who were associated with the non-Āryan Sālvas.[14] It was only in the late Brāhmaṇa period circa 650 B. C. or so that the Kaśyapas were allowed to officiate in Yajñas. One Kaśyapa officiated in the sacrifice of Viśvakarman Bhauvana.[15] Dānava Kaśyapa was completely assimilated in the Brāhmaṇa society only in the Anukramaṇī period circa 500-200 B. C.

Ikṣvāku lineage

The Ahi people descended from Kaśyapa, the Aikṣvāka. There may be deep reasons for Kaśyapa to separate from the original stock. They have to be discovered elsewhere as that enquiry here would be beyond the scope of our present purpose. As we just now discuss, the Vṛtras, the Asuras, the Rāksasas, the Paṇis and their other associate tribes belonged to the Ahi stock. The pūrus, the yadus, the Anus, the Turvaśas and the Druhyus had Ahi blood in their veins. And they are the most prominent Brahmāryan adversaries in the Ṛgveda. They rightly deserve to be called a Race. They appear in the Rgveda as a race while Ikṣvākus only as a very minor tribe. But the organic critical enquiry proves the Ikṣvākus at the origin of all the above mentioned peoples; hence, the Ikṣvāku is the original race. We may, at best, call the Ahi stock only a sub-race of the Ikṣvāku race.

2. THE AHI PEOPLE

Purpose of Indra

When Indra was born, he asked his mother about the mighty and renowned people whom he had to destroy. His strong mother answered that Aurṇavābha and Ahiśuva are

13. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa; 7. 27.

14. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa; 10. 4. 1. 10.

15. (1) Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 8. 21.
(2) Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 13. 7. 1. 15.

the mighty foes whom Indra shall overcome.[16] Ahiśuva was a Dāsa having associations with Śṛbinda, Anarśani, Pipru and Arbuda,[17] the Dasyus. Aurṇavābha the descendant of Ūrṇavābhi, was a great teacher belonging to the school of the Aitihāsikas who relied on traditional legends.[18] He appears to be a wise, learned and experienced spiritual leader with high intellect; the embodiment of the culture and civilization of the Brahmāryan foes. He was a doctor in pre-Āryan ancient history. Indra killed both Aurnavābha and Ahiśuva along with Vṛtra and Arbuda.[19]

Ahi-hā

Indra is Ahi-hā[20] The word Ahi denotes the enemies of Indra in general.[21] Indra alone[22] and with Soma[23] destroys the Ahis. Ahis were powerful people[24] possessing great wisdom[25] The great wisdom (Ahi-Māyā) of the Ahis was an object of adoration which Bṛhaspati himself learnt[26] They possessed very high knowledge.[27] They were spiritually so much advanced that splendour issued forth from their bodies which even the Devas could not resist[28] Maruts borrowed their splendour from Ahis.[29] They were swift as thought.[30] They considered themselves immortals.[31]

16. Ṛgveda 8. 8. 1-2.
17. Ṛgveda 8. 5 2 2-3.
18. Macdonell & Keith, Vedic Index, 1958; Vol. I, page 128-129.
19. Ṛgveda 8. 5. 2. 26.
20. Ṛgveda 2. 2. 8. 3.
21. Ṛgveda 1. 17. 2. 9. 1. 1. 7. 3. 9.
22. Ṛgveda 2. 3. 8. 1; 6. 2. 3. 14; 3. 3. 4. 7; 6. 2. 2. 9.
23. Ṛgveda 6. 6. 3; 9. 5. 3. 4.
24. (1) Ṛgveda 5. 3. 1. 5.
(2) Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā (V. SM.); Vol. II. page 819.
25. Ṛgveda 6. 5. 3. 15.
26. Ṛgveda 1. 24. 11. 4.
27. Ṛgveda 1. 11. 7. 8-9.
28. Ṛgveda 8. 9. 13. 14-15.
29. Ṛgveda 1. 23. 8. 1.
30. Ṛgveda 1. 24. 7. 5.
31. Ṛgveda 2. 1. 11. 2.

Mountaneous people

The Ahis lived in mountains [32] They presided over watery regions. [33] The Ahis owned Water, [34] .i.e. canals and tanks flowing full of waters. Their dwellings were covered by waters [35] Ahis were water-born, sitting amongst the waters of the rivers. [36] Vṛtra was an Ahi [37] whom Indra killed. Indra killed the first born or the greatest leader of the Ahis. [38] He slew Ahi the Great. [39] Ahis were Dāsas and Dasyus. [40] Indra killed Ahi when he was sleeping, not in open combat. May be, these high spiritual people believed in meditation. The Brahmāryans might have thought them sleeping, when they might have been in meditative mood with closed eyes. These meditative Ahis were sons of Danu. [41]

Peaceful people

This description of Ahis reveals that they were a highly developed peaceful people with great intellectual and spiritual powers They were so much intellectually advanced that Bṛhaspati, master of the Brahma, had to learn sciences and humanities from the Ahis. They were the great spiritual leaders who though physically subjugated taught metaphysics to their victors. They never attacked even the invading Āryans. The word Ahi primarily must have denoted peace. But the word Ahi is generally given the meaning of killer, slayer or murderer. But the Ṛgvedic Ahis committed none of these sinful acts. They even did not retaliate. The word Ahi must have

---

32. Ṛgveda 1. 7. 2. 1.
33. (1) Ṛgveda 2. 1. 11. 2; 7. 2. 4. 3.
    (2) Ṛgveda Saṁhitā (VS. M.) Vol. II. page 37.
34. Ṛgveda 4. 2. 7. 1.
35. Ṛgveda 2. 1. 11. 5.
36. Ṛgveda 7. 3. 1. 16.
37. Ṛgveda 1. 10. 1. 4.
38. Ṛgveda 1. 7. 2. 3–4.
39. Ṛgveda 2. 1. 11. 5.
40. Ṛgveda 2. 1. 11. 2; 5. 2.[17. 7.
41. Ṛgveda 1. 15. 10. 7; 2. 2. 1. 11; 4. 2. 9. 2. 3; 5. 2. 18. 2 .

denoted something quite opposite to violence. Sāyaṇa provides some clue to this connotation. He comments the word Ahi as Ahīna, Utkṛṣṭa.[42] He has given the meaning of the word 'hi' with 'a' as prefix in the negative sense; the word 'hi' may be derived from √Han in the sense of killing, slaying, violence. With "a" prefix in the negative sense the word Ahi shall mean a Non-Slayer.[43] Yāska gives the word Ahi, the sense of cloud on account of its motion, it moves in the atmosphere. This other (meaning of) Ahi, i.e., serpant, is derived from the same root also, or from a √han (to attack) with its preposition shortened, it attacks.[44] The etymologies of this word given by Yāska are absurd He gave this absurd etymology under popular pressure in sixth century B. C. when he flourished [46] Yāska had no historical sense and the facts of history had become obliterated in his times. Had he known the true history of the Second Millennium B C, he would certainly have derived the word Ahi from √Han with prefix 'a' in the negative sense, meaning 'Non-Slayer.' Yāska fell pray to the twisted facts of history. The Ahis of history never attacked, they were the attacked. The Ahis were a peaceful, non-violent people inhabiting Bhārata at the time of brutal Brahmāryan invasions.

3. THE VṚTRAS

Human Vṛtras

Vṛtra was an Ahi.[47] Vṛtra was born of Danu [48] Vṛtra was a human being with head, hands, jaws and other limbs [49]

42. Ṛgveda Saṁhitā (V S. M); Vol I. pages 440-441.

43. Dr. P. L Vaidya, of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, in reply to my letter dated 12-6-1961, writes in his letter dated 14-6-1961 as follows—

"If for any reasons these senses (cloud or serpant) do not suit a particular context, it (Ahi) can be interpreted as non-Slayer deriving it from, Han with a negative sense"

44. Lakshman Sarup, The Nighantu and the Nirukta; 1962; p. 32.

45. Siddheswer Varma; The Etymologies of Yāska, 1953, page 118.

46. Lakshman Sarupa; op. cit. page 54.

47. Ṛgveda 1. 10. 1 4

48. Ṛgveda 1, 7, 2, 9; 2, 1, 11, 18; 4, 3, 9, 7.

49. Ṛgveda 13, 7, 5; 8, 2, 1, 6; 8, 8, 7, 2; 8, 2, 1, 13; 8, 2, 2, 23; 1, 11, 4, 6; 1, 10, 2, 10.

Vṛtra is the collective name of a tribe composed of Vṛtra members. Indra slew ninety times nine Vṛtras.[50] When the Brahmāryan military forces invaded Bhārata; they had to contend with their principal enemies, the Vrtras; the most important tribe of the Ahi race. The Brahmāryan enemies in general are known to the Ṛgveda as Vṛtras.[51] Innumeral Vṛtras were slain.[52] Not only Indra[53] but Agni[54] Bṛhaspati[55] and Soma[56] are Vṛtra-hā. Indra and Varuṇa, Indra and Agni, Indra and Viṣnu, Maruts, Mitra and Varuna and Soma are slayers of Vṛtras.[57] They are not only slayers of Vrtras but they are their utter destroyers (Vrtrahantamaṁ).[58]

Vṛtra region

The domain of the Vrtras was very wide and extensive They populated the whole of Iran,[59] the far western province of Bhārata, Arachosia, Gedrosia and North-West mountaneous regions of Punjab. They were mainly mountaneous people.[60] Indra had to cross ninetynine streams to kill the Ahi Vrtra.[61]

50. Ṛgveda 1, 13, 11, 13.

51. Ṛgveda 1, 3, 1, 2, 1, 10, 3, 6; 1, 15, 9, 7; 3, 4, 12, 5, 4, 3, 3, 10; 4, 3, 1, 9; 6, 2, 1, 34; 6, 2, 4, 13; 6, 4, 1, 14, 6, 5, 8, 3; 6, 5, 11, 6; 6, 3, 2, 1, 8; 7, 2, 3, 10; 7, 1, 1, 10; 7, 2, 15, 15; 7, 2, 14, 6; 7, 5, 13, 9; 7, 5, 15, 3; 7, 6, 3, 4; 8, 3, 3, 3-11; 8, 3, 5, 8, 9, 8, 9, 10, 5, 8, 10, 2, 9, 9,1, 1,10.

52. Ṛgveda 4, 4, 10, 7; 7, 2, 5, 2; 7, 2, 6, 3; 7, 2, 13, 2; 8,4,9,4.

53. Ṛgveda 1, 4, 5, 8, 1, 15, 7, 2, 1, 24, 7, 6; 3, 3, 1, 5; 5, 3, 8, 4; 6, 4, 4, 6; 8, 1, 2, 26; 8, 1, 4, 11; 8, 2, 1, 40; 8, 9, 13, 2; 8, 7, 7, 3.

54. Ṛgveda 6, 2, 1, 19; 2, 1, 1, 11, 3, 2, 8, 4; 1. 13, 1, 3.

55. Ṛgveda 6, 6. 12. 2.

56. Ṛgveda 9, 2, 13, 5; 9, 2, 4, 3; 9, 2, 1, 3, 9, 5, 4, 7.

57. Ṛgveda 4, 4, 9, 2, 7, 6, 5, 11; 6, 4, 5, 21; 9, 3, 1, 20; 9, 7, 7, 2, 9, 1, 17, 1; 6, 2, 5, 2; 6, 6, 7, 3.

58. Ṛgveda 5, 3, 8, 1, 3, 8, 9, 13, 16, 30; 8, 10, 4, 5, 8, 2, 1, 37; 8, 6, 4, 8; 8, 9, 13, 32; 8, 1, 3, 17, 6, 2, 1, 48; 8, 8, 5, 4; 8, 4, 0, 7; 8, 9, 9, 1.

59. Buddha Prakash; Vṛtra; A. B. O. R. I. Vol. 30 page 200.

60. Ṛgveda 1. 7. 2-8; 4 2. 7. 3.

61. Ṛgveda 2. 7. 2. 15.

Indra shattered ninetynine cities of Vṛtra and occupied the hundredth as his abode.[62] Vṛtras covered vast territories. Indra had to kill Vṛtras in the east, in the west and in the north.[63]

Vrtras were dark people.[64] They were the masters of large rivers and vast treasures of the mountains. Indra snatched violently for the Āryas the vast regions irrigated by rivers and formerly possessed by Vṛtras.[65] The Brahmāryans invaded the Vrtras for their lands and wealth.

The Vṛtras did not offer any military resistance to the invaders. One single Deva Vṛtra is referred to have returned the blow Indra and Ahi are referred to have contended,[66] but Vṛtras were generally resistless in combats.[67]

Matriarchal people

Vrtras were matriarchal people. Vrtra's mother Danu was the matriarch of the Dānava race.[68] Vrtras are referred to in the Rgveda not only as Ahis but also as Dāsas and Dasyus like the Ahis. The epithets Dāsas and Dasyus are non-ethnic terms which carry different connotations as discussed just later.

Republican administrators

Vrtras were a constituent tribe of the Ahi sub-race They were wise and intelligent people with their own culture, civilization, science, language and ideology. It appears that they constituted the self-effacing, self-less and ascetic hierarchy of the wise administrators of Bhāratīya Janarepublics. They were almost saintly people. It is for this reason that they were accepted in later literature as equals to the Brāhmaṇas

62. Ṛgveda 7. 2 2. 5.

63 Ṛgveda 1. 18. 1. 11; 3. 4. 15. 11.

64. Ṛgveda 2. 2. 9. 7; 3. 3. 3. 6; 3. 3. 2. 21.

65. Ṛgveda 4, 2, 1, 7; 4, 2, 9, 8, 1, 10, 2, 4; 1, 16, 5, 5; 4, 3, 11, 21; 4, 3, 3, 2; 8, 5, 2, 11.

66. Ṛgveda 1. 7. 2. 12–13.

67 Ṛgveda 3. 3. 5. 3.

68. Ṛgveda 3. 3. 1. 8.

and Vṛtra-hatyā by Indra was considered as abominable as Brahma-hatyā. [69]

The Ahi-power was finally crushed on the confluence of Vipāś and Śutudri. [70] This perhaps refers to the Brahmāryan victory in the Dāsarājña War. The Brahmāryans contended with the remnants of the Vṛtras after their final victory in the Dāsarājña War Indra's son Trasadasyu from Purukutsānī, the widow of Purukutsa, was a great destroyer of the remnant Vrtras. Indra helped him in battles with Vrtras for the possession of the earth. [71] It appears that Vṛtras wielded immense political power as high administrators of the Bhāratīya republics The Vrtras were self-less and saintly administrators who dedicated their lives in the service of the people and for the good of the people.

4. THE RAKṢASAS

Human people

The Raksasas were a class of the Ahi sub-race. [72] They formed a class [73] reputed for its valour and physical might. [74] Sāyana also understands by Raksasas a tribe.[75] Rakṣas means a defender, a repeller of violence. [76]

Rakṣo-hā

The Brahmāryan Devas are the killers of the Rakṣasas and the Rakṣa class. Indra, [77] Bṛhaspati, [78] Soma, [79] Aświns [80] and Agni [81] are Rakso-hā, the destroyers of the Raksasas.

69. Taittirīya Saṁhitā 2. 5. 1. 1.
70. Rgveda 3. 3. 4. 6.
71. Rgveda 7. 2. 2 3.
72. (1) Ṛgveda, 7. 6. 15. 9.
(2) Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā (V. S. M.); Vol. III page 511.
73. Ṛgveda 7. 6. 15. 4.
74. Ṛgveda 1. 4. 1. 5; 8. 1. 29; 8. 7. 1. 8, 20.
75. Ṛgveda Saṁhitā, Vol. I. page 161.
76. (1) Nirukta, 4. 18.
(2) Ṛgveda 1. 8. 1. 15.
(3) Ṛgveda Saṁhitā (V. S. M.); Vol. I. page 275.
77. Ṛgveda 1. 19. 3. 6; 1, 19. 3. 11; 6. 4. 2. 18.
78. Ṛgveda 2. 3. 1. 3.
79. Ṛgveda 9. 1. 12; 9. 2. 13. 3; 9. 3. 7. 20.
80. Ṛgveda 7. 5. 3. 4.
81. Ṛgveda 7. 1. 8. 6.

Violent annihilation of rakṣasas

The Ṛgveda records various Brahmāryan battles with the Rakṣasas. Agni overcomes the great and exulting Rakṣasas.[82] Indra and Soma afflict and destroy the Rakṣasas.[83] Indra alone is a destroyer of the Raksasas.[84] Some scatters the Raksasas and drives away these Brahmāryan adversaries, [85] confers wealth [86] and demolishes the strong dwellings of the Raksasas. Savitṛ drives away the Raksasas.[87] Parjanya[88] also destroys the Rakṣasas and Brhaspati, [89] consumes them. Agni destroys the Raksasas and wins their wealth [90] Agni, the especial destroyer of Vrtra, who carried off the treasures of the these people, also annihilated the Rakṣasas. [91] King Purupantha [92] granted horses to Nāsatyas for slaying the Rakṣas.[93] The Raksasas fought against the Brahmāryan along with the Ahi people. [94]

Military power

The Raksasas had confidence in their purity of means and also so asserted.[95] They were the enemies of the Veda [96] They possessed good houses, vast wealths and populated cities [97] As they strongly repelled and offered resistance to the Brahmāryan violent attacks, they were termed by them mischievous

82. Ṛgveda 4. 1. 3. 14; 4. 1. 4. 1; 4. 1. 4. 15, 8.4.3.14; 8.7.1 19.
83. Ṛgveda 7, 6, 15, 1; 7, 6, 15, 4.
84. Rgveda 6, 4, 2, 18; 1, 19, 3, 11, 7, 6, 15, 19; 7, 5, 15-5
85. Ṛgveda 9, 2, 29, 1; 7, 6. 15. 17; 9, 3, 3, 28, 29; 9, 5, 1, 48; 9, 5, 6, 4, 9, 1, 17, 3, 9, 2, 13, 1, 9, 2, 25, 5; 9, 2, 32, 1.
86. Rgveda 9, 6, 1, 10.
87. Ṛgveda 1, 7, 5, 10.
88. Ṛgveda 5, 6, 11, 2.
89. Ṛgveda 2, 3, 1, 14.
90. Ṛgveda 6, 2, 1, 29.
91. Rgveda 6, 2, 1, 48.
92. Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā, Vol. III, page 228.
93. Ṛgveda 6, 6, 2, 10, 8, 5, 5, 16, 18.
94. Ṛgveda 7, 3, 5, 7.
95. Ṛgveda 7, 6, 15, 16.
96. Ṛgveda 3, 3, 1, 17.
97. Ṛgveda 1, 23, 10, 3.

and oppressive.[98] It is significant that Vasiṣṭha, a hero of the Dāsarājña war, refers most about the Raksasas in the whole body of the Ṛgveda. The Brahmāryan military forces under him were directly met by the Raksasas in the battlefields hence this direct testimony of one who participated in that war. The Rakṣasas appear to be the martial class of the Bhāratīya people who defended their motherland, against the foreign, Brahmāryan invasions.

Human rakṣas

Rakṣa, in the Ṛgveda, means to protect, to preserve.[99] The people whose primary duty in the pre-Āryan society was to protect and preserve the country and her people were known as Rakṣasas. They were a specific unit by themselves; they constituted the Raksa tribe.

The Raksasas had strong dwellings.[100] They might have developed the art of fortifications due to the Brahmāryan military onslaughts. The massive fortifications developed and protected by the Raksasas were later destroyed by Purandara Indra. The Raksasas, the protectors of cities and forts, were very mighty and strong people.[101] Rakṣasas people were numerous[102] Their race was a developing one.[103]

Raksasas were great and exulting people[104] They were the enemies of the Veda[105] and what that implied. They were the

---

98. Rgveda 7, 6, 15, 9.
99. Rgveda 1, 5, 1, 3, 1, 7, 5, 11; 1, 10, 4, 11.
100. Ṛgveda 9, 5, 6, 5.
101. Rgveda 7, 6, 5, 12; 8, 4, 2, 18, 8,6,5,12; 8,7,1,8; 2,1,11,18.
102. Ṛgveda 1, 5, 4, 5; 1, 14, 2, 9; 1, 19, 7, 5; 3, 3, 1, 16, 6, 2, 3, 10; 7, 6, 15, 13, 1, 13, 3, 3; 1, 13, 6, 6; 3, 2, 3, 1; 5, 3, 10: 10; 7, 1, 1, 13; 7, 6, 15, 21-22; 8; 7, 1, 10, 9, 3, 6, 19; 9, 4, 4, 1, 9, 7, 1, 6; 1, 13, 6, 12; 7, 1: 15, 10; 8. 4, 3, 13, 8, 6, 1, 26.
103. Ṛgveda 7, 6, 15, 4.
104. Ṛgveda 4, 1, 3, 14.
105. Ṛgveda 3, 3, 1, 17.

adversaries of the Brahmāryans.[106] The Rakṣasas were wealthy people, possessed treasures and cattle. [107]

Indra, [108] Agni [109] and Soma [110] are Rakṣo-hā. Aśvins, Savitṛ, Bṛhaspati, Indra, Agni, Parjanya, Maruts, Dydus, Pṛthvi and Adityas slay the Rakṣasas.[111] The Raksasas concentrated against Indra [112] and they were destroyed on the east, on the west, on the south and on the north. [113]

Defence power

The Raksasas organised the military defences of the Bhāratīya people against the Brahmāryan invasions. They also offered befitting onslaughts. They also marched upon the Āryan military troops to strengthen their defences The Brahmāryans were afraid of the Raksasas military onslaughts and they were always cautious above the Rakṣa penetrations into their military organisation. They organised the prevention of the entry of Raksasas and the Brahmāryan war leaders protected their troops from the Rakṣasas.[114] May be, Raksasas had also developed the technique of guerrila warfare Indra and Agni played the most important part in annihilating the Raksa-power

The Raksasas belonged to the Ahi race Sāyaṇa translates Ahi as Rāksasa. [115] Raksa was the military organisation of the Ahi State or the Ahi people. They by themselves formed the Raksa tribe, a constituent of the Ahi sub-Race. They usually

106. Ṛgveda 9, 2, 29, 1.

107. Ṛgveda 6, 2, 1, 19; 6, 2, 1, 48, 7, 1, 8, 6; 9, 6, 1, 10.

108. Ṛgveda 1, 19, 3, 6.

109. Ṛgveda 7, 1, 8, 6.

110. Ṛgveda 9, 1, 7, 2; 9, 2, 13, 3, 9, 3, 7, 20.

111. Ṛgveda 6, 6, 1, 8, 7, 5, 3, 4; 1, 7, 5, 10; 1, 19, 3, 11; 2, 3, 1, 14; 4, 1, 4, 1, 15; 8, 4, 3, 14; 5, 6, 11, 2, 7, 6, 15,17; 9, 3, 3, 29, 9, 5. 1, 48; 1, 19, 3, 11; 2, 3, 13.

112. Ṛgveda 6, 2, 6, 7.

113. Ṛgveda 7, 6, 15, 19.

114. Ṛgveda 8, 7, 1, 20; 1, 8, 1, 15.

115. (1) Ṛgveda 7, 6, 15, 9,

(2) Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā (V. S. M.) Vol. III, page 511.

appear with the Ahis and the Vṛtras also along with the Dāsa and the Dasyu. The Rakṣasas were the main spearhead and backbone of the Ahi defence, to the Brahmāryan military invasions.

5. THE PAṆIS

Human Panis

The Panis were renowned for their wealth and treasures. The richest section of the Ahi race were known as Paṇis. The Brahmāryan military leaders were always after the wealth of the Panis. Soma won the wealth of kine from Paṇis. Soma destroyed the voracious Pani who was verily a wolf Soma discovered the wealth of the Pani.[116] Pusan pierces the hearts of the Panis and renders the complacent[117] towards the Brahmāryans. The wealth of the Panis was detrimental to them in two ways. It made them luxurious and complacent and invited the greed of the foreigners. Aśvins also take the life of the Panis and discard the disposition of the Panis.[118] Agni recovered the kine from the Panis. Agni baffles the intelligent and might of Pani.[119] Rājā Aśmati gained victory over Panis.[120]

Economic power

Indra wields supreme power in the liquitation of the Paṇi economic power. Indra along with Soma crushed the Panis by force whose wealth Agni and Soma had looted.[121] The slayer of Vṛtra[122] overpowered the Panis who probably were the followers of Vrtra. Indra, then, plundered the wealth of the Panis.[123]

Annihilation of Pani power

Aṅgirasas were no lesser enemies of the Panis than Indra. Indra, associated with Angirasas, determined to recover cattle

116. Ṛgveda 9, 1, 22, 7; 6, 5, 2, 14; 9, 7, 8, 2.

117. Ṛgveda 4, 5, 4, 5, 7.

118. Ṛgveda 1, 25, 3, 3; 3, 5, 5, 2, 1, 24, 5, 2.

119. Ṛgveda 7, 1, 9, 2; 6, 1, 13, 3.

120. Ṛgveda 10, 4, 18, 6.

121. Ṛgveda 6, 4, 1, 22; 1, 14, 9, 4.

122. Ṛgveda 8, 7, 7, 10.

123. Ṛgveda 5, 3, 2, 7.

hidden in the mountain, overwhelmed the Paṇis. Indra with Aṅgirasas had slain the Paṇis. And then Aṅgirasas acquired all the wealth of Paṇis, comprising horses and cows and other animals. The Paṇis had immense treasures of wealth. The Aṅgirasas looted the Paṇis' wealth to their hearts desires and sufficient still remained to be appropriated by the other remaining followers of Indra [124]

Agni, the most efficient Brahmāryan weapon, played no lesser part in utterly routing the Paṇis. The Aṅgirasas had searched the wealth of the Paṇis on every side. The wealth was hidden in caves of mountains. They pursued it through the main road. It was with great difficulty that the precious treasures were discovered. Even, then, they were not available to the Brahmāryans They set destructive Agni to the rock, which till then was not there, and thus won those precious treasures [126]

The Paṇis were the offsprings of Brsaya [127] Bṛsaya is a name of Tvaṣṭṛ whose son was Vṛtra. [128] The Paṇis, thus, were the real brothers of Vṛtras. The Paṇis appear in the Ṛgveda as related to Ahi and Vṛtra [129]

Ayājñics

The Brahmāryans detested the Paṇis because they were a-Yājñics *and did not allow them any share in their treasures* The Paṇis are frequently called misers in the Ṛgveda. They wanted them to be liberal in donating [130] their wealth to the Brahmāryans. They eulogised these Paṇis who munificently donated them vast wealths. Brbu stood in high esteem with the Brahmāryans for his liberal donations. [131] The Paṇis had strongly

124. Ṛgveda 6, 3, 16, 2; 6, 3, 10, 2, 1, 13, 10, 4.
125. Ṛgveda 7, 2, 2, 9.
126. Ṛgveda 2, 3, 2, 6-7.
127. Ṛgveda 1, 14, 9, 4; 6, 5, 12, 3.
128. Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā (V. S. M.) Vol. III. page 218.
129. Ṛgveda 1, 7, 2, 11.
130. Ṛgveda 6, 4, 5, 3, 6.
131. Ṛgveda 6, 4, 2, 31.

opposed Yājñic civilization and culture. Yajñas when ritualised were the main source as bringers of donations. The Brahmāryans therefore strongly despised the non-offerer Panis. The Panis when awoke were reluctant to make holy offerings and to offer Dānas The Brahmāryan Ṛṣis pray Usā to keep the Panis slept and unawakened for ever. [132] Indra is asked to contract no friendship with the Pani who offers not any libation but he is requested to take away his wealth and destroy him.[133] Panis had sufficient Ghī but did not offer it for libations which the Āryan leaders discovered. [134] Aśvins are to destroy the withholders of offerings, the Panis. They take the life of the Pani who makes no oblation [135] The Panis evoked the historical Brahmāryan wrath for their opposition to the Yajña and for possessing immense wealth.

Slaying of Vala

Vala was the greatest leader of the Panis[136] when the Brahmāryans moved towards Bhārata from West Asia. Trita is the predecessor of Indra from whom Indra took over his functions Before Indra, Trita had his combats with the Panis. Indra, with his allies, warring against the forces of Vrtra, broke through the defences of Vala as did Trita. [137] Thus we find Vrtras and Panis together bearing the brunt of the Brahmāryan violent onslaughts. It appears that Panis came in conflict with the Āryans even before the emergence of Indra as the supreme war-lord.

Indra, aided by Angirasas, had slain Vala and won the cows. [138] The cows of Vala were kept hidden in the caves of the mountains He had to force his way through the passes of

---

132 Ṛgveda 1 18 4 10, 1 21 12. 9

133. Ṛgveda 4 3 4. 7.

134. Ṛgveda 4. 5. 13 4

135 Ṛgveda 1. 24. 5. 2, 1. 24. 3. 3.

136. (1) Ṛgveda 6. 3. 16. 2.
(2) Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā (V. S. M.) Vol. II. page 44.

137. Ṛgveda 1. 10. 2. 5.

138 Ṛgveda 2. 1. 11. 20; 2. 2. 3. 3.

the mountains and broke their artificial defences. [139] Brhaspati also played a very prominent part against the might of Vala. Brhaspati was the leader of the Angirasa-Gana. He destroyed Vala and won the kine [140] Brhaspati brought out the cows, after slaughtering the Panis, from the mountain of Vala [141] Indra forced open the gates of the cities of Vala so that his wealth may be bestowed upon the Angirasas. [142] The killing of Vala and the plunder of his wealth frustrated the activities of the Vrtras [143]

The Panis are also referred as Dasyus in the Rgveda [144] They constituted the economic power of the Ahi sub-race. The Vṛtras represented the political and administrative power of the Ahi sub-race. By destroying them Indra became invincible in battle and the lord of all the wealth and the lands comprised in the region watered by seven rivers. [145]

6. THE DĀSAS

Human Dāsas

The Dāsas were human beings having head, breast, heart, and shoulders [146] Dāsa Śambara is spoken of as born of Kulitāra. [147] He was born of a human mother, hence he must have been a human being, a terrestrial foe of the Brahmāryans The Dāsas like the Āryas were a people. [148] Dāsa, like Vrtra, was also the personal name [149] of a leader of the Dāsas. He might have been their supreme leader. Dāsa

139 Ṛgveda 2 2. 4 8.

140 Rgveda 4 5 5. 5

141. Rgveda 10. 5 8. 6, 10. 5. 8. 9, 10. 5. 8 5

142. Ṛgveda 6. 2. 3 5, 8. 3 2 7-8.

143. Rgveda 1. 11 10 1.

144. Ṛgveda 2. 2. 4. 9, 7. 1. 6 3

145. Ṛgveda 2, 2, 1, 3

146. Ṛgveda 1. 22 2. 5, 2. 2. 9. 6; 4. 2. 8. 9; 5 2. 6. 7 8; 6 2. 5. 6; 10. 10. 8. 2.

147. Ṛgveda 4. 3. 9. 14.

148. Ṛgveda 6. 3. 10. 3; 8. 5. 13. 1; 10. 5. 9. 6; 10. 6. 15. 1.

149. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 2. 2; 8. 4. 4. 27. 2. 2. 9. 6; 5. 3. 1 4.

people were the enemies [150] of the Brahmāryans. Vṛtra, the great leader of the Vṛtras, was also a Dāsa. [151]

The word Dāsa, as also the word Dasyu, is derived from √Das. Its Indo-European (Europāryan) parallel is des 'to divide' 'to decrease'. Yāska traces the word Dāsa to √Das in the sense of 'to finish' but this is a later development. [152] To Divide means to Distribute. The Division in the sense of Giving is the connotation of the word Dāsa in the Ṛgveda. Sāyana gives the meaning of Giving to this word.[153] Its derivative word Dāsvān means a donor, a liberal donor. Agni is the invoker of the god on behalf of the Dāsvataḥ. Usā is Dāsvatī. Agni is bouunteous to the Dāsvat of offerings. The Rgveda refers to Dāsvat Indra. Dāsvantam (Donor) Agni is giver of dwellings. The birth of a firm and Dāsvān (liberal) son has been cherished. Indra is lauded to grant a son who shall be most vigorous, delighter, a pious sacrificer and a liberal Dāsvān (giver) who shall conquer opposing enemies in combats. He who spontaneously presents, Indra and Varuna, is Dāsvān (liberal), wealthy and upright, he shall prosper with the food of his adversary and possess riches and opulent descendants. [154]

Dāsa Balbūtha is eulogised as a great giver of gifts. [155] Dāsa Yadus and Turvaśas were conquished in the Dāśarājña war circa 1150 B. C. The vanquished Bharatas and some of their constituent tribes had been converted to the Brahmāryan fold. Some Yadus and Turvaśas had also coalesced with the invaders who had now settled in Brahmāvarta. The Dāsas, the Yadus and the Turvasas, as before, were the great donors and they donated cows for the meals of Manu Sāvarni. [156] The Tenth Maṇḍala

150. Ṛgveda 10. 4. 4. 7; 10. 4 12. 1.

151. Ṛgveda 10. 4. 6. 7.

152. Siddheswar Varma; The Etymologies of Yāska; 1953, pages 56-57.

153. Ṛgveda Saṁhitā (V. S. M.) Vol. IV. page 527

154. Ṛgveda 5. 1. 9. 2; 1. 9. 5. 1; 2. 1. 4. 3; 10. 11. 16. 2, 1. 19. 1. 1; 4. 1. 2. 7; 6. 3. 10. 1, 6. 6. 7. 5.

155. Ṛgveda 8. 6. 4. 32.

156. Ṛgveda 10. 5. 2. 10.

of the Ṛgveda was not composed before 800 B. C. It appears that the Dāsas as such were not hated till 800 B.C. They were hated only as enemies otherwise they as liberal doners were held in very high esteem by the Brahmāryan Ṛṣis.

Custodians of Social Wealth

The Dāsa treasures and riches are very famous with the Brahmāryans. Sūkta 8. 5. 10 of the Ṛgveda contains a refrain "May all our enemies perish." Indra and Agni are to win victories over the Dāsas and to loot their accumulated wealth, to bestow that wealth upon their followers so that the enemies may further be destroyed,[157] The Brahmāryans wanted to obtain the ample wealth of the Dāsas. Indra conquers the treasures of the Dāsas. The strength of the Dāsas was based on their accumulated treasures[158] which Indra won and divided amongst his followers.

We have two Ṛgvedic references to the "Accumulated Treasures" of the Dāsas. The state controlled the social production in pre-Āryan times. A sufficient part of the agricultural and industrial produce was owned by the society. Internal trade was controlled by the state. International trade was the monopoly of the state.[159] The excavation in the Śramaṇic region reveal the existence of large granaries at Harappa and Mohenjodaro and also in Egypt and Mesopotamia. The combined floor space of the Harappa granaries was something over 9002 Sq. ft. and approximates closely to that of Mohenjodaro granary.[160] The Ṛgvedic and archaeological evidences combine to prove that the Dāsas were in charge of the state economy of the region. The public wealth was under their superintendence which they 'divided', according to state rules and regulations, for use of the people and for international trade. Because they handled and managed

157. Ṛgveda 8. 5. 10. 1. 6.

158. Ṛgveda 1. 14. 8. 8; 3. 3. 5. 1; 8. 5. 10. 6.

159. R. C. Jain, The most Ancient Āryan Society, Chapter I.

160. Sir Mortimer Wheeler; The Indus Sivilization, 1953; Pages 21, 22, 28, 31.

the "accumulated treasures" of the society; they, by and by, came to know as the 'givers' of that wealth, the Dāsas.

Destruction of Dāsa power

The vast treasures of the Dāsas invited large and wholesale destruction from the Brahmāryan Devas. Indra slew Dāsa Śambara, Śuṣna, Kuyava, Namuchi, Varchin, Śribinda, Anarśaṇi, Pipru, Ahiśuva and Viśa.[161] Indra destroyed both classes of enemies—the Dāsas, Vṛtras and the Āryas.[162] The Brahmāryan Devas repressed the wrath of Dāsa.[163] Indra and Viṣṇu baffled Dāsa-Māyā of Vrsaśipra in conflicts.[164] Indra slew five hundreds and thousands of the followers of Dāsa Varchin.[165] Ṛṣi Babhru associated with Indra in grinding the head of Dāsa Namuchi.[166] Indra slew 30000 Dāsas.[167]

The Dāsas were lustrous people. It is for this reason that Indra assumed the epithet Dāsa.[168] The Dāsas considered themselves immortal.[169] It appears that they believed in the high spiritual truth of immortality. Dāsa-Māyā[170] or the wisdom of the Dāsas in sciences and humanities was great. They were dark-skinned people. Dāsa-Varna[171] stands in contradistinction to the Ārya-Varṇa.[172] The Dāsas belonged to the Ahi sub-race.[173]

---

161. Ṛgveda 4. 3. 9. 14; 7. 2. 2. 2; 5. 2. 16. 7. 8; 6. 2. 5. 6; 6. 4. 4. 21; 2. 2. 2. 8; 8. 5. 2. 2; 4. 3. 9. 15.
162. Ṛgveda 6. 3. 10. 3; 8. 5. 13. 1, 10. 5. 9. 6.
163. Ṛgveda 1. 15. 11. 2.
164. Ṛgveda 7. 6. 10. 4.
165. Ṛgveda 4. 3. 9. 15.
166. Ṛgveda 5. 2. 16. 8.
167. Ṛgveda 4. 3. 9. 21.
168. Ṛgveda 3. 3. 5. 1.
169. Ṛgveda 2. 1. 11. 2.
170. Ṛgveda 7. 6. 10. 4.
171. Ṛgveda 1. 19. 4. 8; 2. 2. 1. 4; 7. 1. 5. 3; 9. 3. 11. 2.
172. Ṛgveda 1. 15. 11. 2; 1. 15. 7. 18; 3. 3. 4. 9.
173. Ṛgveda 2. 1. 11. 2.

Dāsī Culture

The Dāsa-culture, as depicted in the Ṛgveda, is subordinate to Dāsī-culture. Dāsīs enjoy more power, prestige and honour than the Dāsas. Dāsīs were not the wives of the Dāsas; they stood on their own independant rights. The wives of Dāsas, in the Ṛgveda, are specifically mentioned by the word Dāsapatnī. This subject, so far as I know, has not till now been dealt with in this light.

The Ṛgveda refers to the cities or forts of the Dāsīs. Indra had gone on destroying the cities of Dāsīs.[174] Indra shattered seven cities of Śāradī and killed the Dāsīs.[175] Śāradī was perhaps a relation of Asura Śarata.[176] Indra destroyed the seven cities of Śāradī and humbled the people (Viśah) speaking hostile speech (Mṛdhrvāchaḥ). Indra destroyed Vrtra.[177] Indra destroyed the cities of Śāradī, the mortal, who offered not sacrifice.[178] Indra and Agni, with one united effort, overthrew ninety cities ruled over by Dāsapatnīḥ[179] Indra and Āświns demolished various cities of Dāsīs.[180] The Rgveda does not know of any fort or city of any Dāsa destroyed by Indra It knows only the forts or cities of Dāsīs which Indra annihilated.

Dāsī-People

The Rgveda also knows about the Dāsī people (Dāsī-Viśaḥ) but of no Dāsa people (Dāsa-Viśaḥ). Indra overpowers Dāsī-Viśah.[181] Indra made the Dasyu and the Dāsī people devoid of all and abject.[182] Indra overthrew, on the part of the Ārya, all Dāsī-Viśaḥ, everywhere abiding.[183] Dāsī-Viśaḥ are every-

174. Ṛgveda 1. 15. 10. 3.
175. Ṛgveda 6. 2. 5. 10.
176. Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā (V. S. M.) Vol. III. page 82. Sāyaṇa considers these forts belonging to Asura Śarat but the context shows that they belonged to Śāradī, probably his relation.
177. Ṛgveda 1. 23-10. 2.
178. Ṛgveda 1. 19. 5. 4.
179. Ṛgveda 3. 1. 12. 6.
180. Ṛgveda 4. 3. 11. 10; 6. 1. 5. 31.
181. Ṛgveda 2. 1. 11. 4.
182. Ṛgveda 4. 3. 7. 4.
183. Ṛgveda 6. 3. 2. 2.

where conquered by Indra,[184] It appears that the remniscences of the conquest of the Dāsī-people were still fresh with the Brahmāryans even in the early part of first millenium B. C.

Matriarchy

An important social factor of great historical importance emerges from the existence of Dāsī-cities and Dāsī-people in the pre-Āryan Bhārata. It conclusively proves that matriarchal social system was widely prevalent at least in the Ahi sub-race. The social inheritance went by the matrilineal descent. Dāsī and Dāsa concepts are suggestive of social pattern where women had the final say. They ruled. The Vṛtras, the Rakṣas, the Paṇis and others assisted them in various administrative and social capacities for the efficient running of the Ahi local republics that were widely dispersed in Western Bharata comprising the provinces of Iran, Arachosia, Gedrosia, Kashmir, Sindh, Punjab and Rajasthan.

7. THE DASYUS

Total War on Dasyus

Indra was born from remote times for the destruction of Dasyus. He had destroyed Dasyus Śuṣna, Śambara and great Arbuda.[185] Indra sallied forth to destroy the Dasyus.[186] Indra by Māyā humbled the people possessed of Māyā, destroyed the cities of Pipru and defended Rjisvān in the Dasyuhatyā (Dasyu-destroying) contests.[187] Indra slew the Dasyus and demolished their cities and iron cities.[188] Indra overcame dasyus by Māyā.[189] Indra slew the humbled Dasyus and recovered the kine for the Brahma,[190] the Āryan unicollectivity. Indra attacked the Dasyus and the Simyus, slew them with his thunderbolt and then divided the fields belonging to them and plundered by him, with his

184. Ṛgveda 10. 11. 20. 2.
185. Ṛgveda 1. 10. 1. 6.
186. Ṛgveda 1. 15. 10. 4.
187. Ṛgveda 1. 10. 1. 4.
188. Ṛgveda 2. 2. 9. 8; 10. 8. 9. 7.
189. Ṛgveda 3. 3. 5. 6.
190. Ṛgveda 1. 15. 8. 5.

white-complexioned friends.[191] Indra enslaved the Dasyus for Dabhiti.[192] Indra slew Viśvarūpa son of Tvaṣṭṛ through friendship for Trita.[193] Viśvarūpa was the real brother of Vṛtra. Indra slew the Dasyu Śuṣna for Kutsa, also Kuvaya and swiftly destroyed the Dasyus and cut them to pieces in the battle.[194] Indra slew Ahi, arrested Māyā of Śuṣṇa urging the combat and had overcome the Dasyus. He put to sleep the Dasyus, Chumuri and Dhuni for Dabhiti.[195] Indra, the azure-chinned, destroyed the Pūru, the Vrtras and the Dasyus.[196] It appears that the Vṛtras and the Dasyus connoted two categories Indra hurled down the Dasyus.[197] Indra destroyed the Dasyus.[198] Indra by destroying the Dasyus wiped off their existence from the earth.[199] Indra slew the Dasyu and stormed their numerous hostile cities.[200] Indra is not only Amitra-hā, Vratra-hā, Rakṣo-hā, Asura-hā, Sapatna-hā but also Dasyu-hā;[201] nay; Dasyuhantamam, the utter destroyer of the Dasyus.[202]

Agni, the second in command to the supreme commander Indra, does not lag behind Indra in destroying the Dasyus. Agni, the arrestor of the Dasyus, the Vṛtra-han, slew the Dasyu.[203] Agni destroys Dasyus and thus protects his own people.[204] Agni, destroying the Dasyu has discovered the

191. Ṛgveda 1. 15. 7. 18.
192. Ṛgveda 2. 2. 2. 9.
193 Ṛgveda 2. 1. 11. 19.
194. Ṛgveda 4. 2. 6. 12.
195. Ṛgveda 5. 2. 17. 7; 7. 2. 2. 4.
196. Ṛgveda 6. 3. 6. 6.
197. Ṛgveda 8. 3. 2. 14.
198. Ṛgveda 10. 4. 13. 8; 10. 8. 9. 8.
199. Ṛgveda 3. 4 11. 2.
200. Ṛgveda 8. 10. 5. 6.
201. Ṛgveda 10. 6. 15. 3; 1. 15. 7. 12; 6. 4. 2. 24; 1. 19. 3. 6; 8. 8. 8. 3.
202. Ṛgveda 10. 12. 19. 2.
203. Ṛgveda 1. 8. 1. 18; 1. 11. 2. 6.
204. Ṛgveda 5. 1. 4. 6.

cows.[205] Agni expels the Dasyus,[206] and also confounds them.[207] Agni also, like Indra, is Dasyuhantamam;[208] the utter destroyer of the Dasyus. Soma,[209] Aśvins,[210] Atri,[211] Maruts,[212] Mitra and Varuṇa,[213] the Brahmāryan Devas, had been very active in destroying the Dasyu power.

Dasyu = Bhāratīya people

The Brahmāryans had waged a total war against the Bhāratiyans. They destroyed the Dasyus to protect the Ārya-Varṇa.[214] Ārya-Varna, in this context, means, the Āryan people. The Dasyu, in contradiction to the Ārya-people, signify, in this context, the Dasyu people. Indra took the Vajra, the thunderbolt, for destroying the Dasyus and their leaders like Śusna. He went on destroying the cities of Dāsīs, casting his shaft against the Dasyus. He accomplished these feats to augment the strength and glory of the Āryas.[215] Dasyus were the inhabitants in general of the cities ruled over by Dāsīs and along with their rulers suffered complete annihilation. Indra always discriminated between the Āryas and the Dasyus.[216] Dasyus always and everywhere remained his enemies. He never gave the name Ārya to Dasyus.[217] He always clearly kept the unbridgeable antagonisim of the Ārya-people and the Dasyu-people in his mind. Dasyu, in the Ṛgveda, thus, stands for the general mass of the people of Bhārata and Ārya, for the general mass of the foreign invaders.

205. Ṛgveda 5. 1. 14. 4.
206. Ṛgveda 7. 1. 5. 6.
207. Ṛgveda 7. 1. 6. 3.
208. Ṛgveda 6. 2. 1. 15; 8. 5 10. 8.
209. Ṛgveda 9. 5. 7. 6; 9. 5. 3. 4.
210. Ṛgveda 1. 17. 2. 21; 1. 17. 2. 3.
211. Ṛgveda 5. 1. 7. 10.
212. Ṛgveda 5. 2. 17. 5.
213. Ṛgveda 5. 5. 14. 3.
214. Ṛgveda 3. 3. 5. 9.
215. Ṛgveda 10. 9. 6. 7; 8. 2. 1. 14; 1. 15. 10. 3.
216. Ṛgveda 1. 10. 1. 8.
217. Ṛgveda 10. 4. 7. 3.

Dasyus were the masters of the manifold treasures [218] which had been the main attraction of the foreign invaders against Bhārata. These Dasyus were utter opponents of the foreign institution of Yajña. The Brahmāryans treated them as following no religious rites [219] because the Dasyus never accepted the Yajñic way. Indra is to consume such Dasyus and triumph over them [220] The Dasyus opposed the Yajñas and paid no loyalty to the Devas. They followed the other Vratas, hence they were dubbed as non-men (inhuman beings). [221]

The Dasyus were Mrdhṛvāchaḥ, speaking a hostile speech. The speeches of the Dasyus and the Āryans were quite distinct. Dasyus spoke some ancient form of Prākṛta The Dasyus in the Rgvedic times spoke a distinct tongue foreign to the Āryans which had little use for nasal sounds. [222]

Two important concepts emerge from our discussions so far in this chapter The two concepts, Dasyu and Ahi, assume special significance The Vrtras, the Raksas, the Panis, the Dāsas and the Dasyus are all Ahis The Vṛtras, the Raksas, the Panis and the Dāsas are all Dasyus. All of them are not Vrtras All of them are not Raksas. All of them are not Paṇis. All of them are not Dāsas because Dāsas themselves are subordinate to Dāsīs The Vrtras, the Raksas, the Panis and the Dāsas are distinct catagories but all of them converge in the genus Ahi and the genus Dasyu The Panis have been referred to as descended from Vṛśaya whose another name was Tvasṭr the Vrtras also descneded

218. Rgveda 6. 1 14 3.

219. Ṛgveda 1. 10. 1. 8.

220. Ṛgveda 1. 23 11. 3; 9. 2 17. 7.

221. Ṛgveda 8. 8. 1. 11.

222. Ṛgveda 5 2. 15. 10. The word 'Anāsa' in this Ṛc has been translated generally as snub-nosed This is anthropologically wrong. The Mediterraneans and the proto-Australoids both were not snub-nosed The language of the Dasyus has been referred in this Ṛc which has been generally held by the scholars to be some form of Ancient Prākrta. Prākṛta language has very little use for nasal sounds Anāsa, means 'devoid of nasal sounds.'

from Tvaṣṭṛ. This shows that Tvaṣṭṛ was an Ahi who was the progenitor of numerious Ahi people. The word Ahi, thus, becomes associated with blood The Ahi blood gave rise to the Ahi people. The Ahi people constituted the ethnic Ahi sub-race.

The Dasyus are the adversaries[223] in general of the Brahmāryan invaders. The cities are ruled by Dāsīs and the Dasyus inhabit these cities. Dasyus belong to the Dāsī-people [224] (Dāsī-Viśaḥ) The Dasyu people were destroyed so that the Āryan or Brahmāryan people may live. It appears that the territorial population, the general mass of the people inhabiting Bhārata, were called by the Brahmāryan invaders as Dasyus, with no stigma attached to the word. The concept Dasyu gives territorial significance while the concept Ahi gives racial significance.

8. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE AHI SUB-RACE

Functional Division of Ahi sub-race

We have noticed in the foregoing discussions that the Bhāratīya people of the mountains offered strong resistance to the foreign invaders They were the people upon whom the main burden of the Brahmāryan annihilation and ruination fell These people belonged to the Ahi sub-race. They were a matriarchal people. The Bhāratīya Jana-republics were ruled by Dāsīs. Dāsas superintended the social wealth. The Panis controlled the economic power. The administrative and defensive power was respectively in the hands of the Vṛtras and the Rakṣas. They, as inhabitants of the land, were known as Dasyus.

Iran—Far Western Bhārata

The epithet Dāsa is quivalent to the Iranian epithet Dahai of the Caspian steppes. [225] Dasyu corresponds with the Iranian Danhu and Dakyu in the sense of a 'province' whence the

223. Ṛgveda 1. 10. 3. 4, 9 2. 17. 2.

224. Ṛgveda 4. 3. 7. 4.

225. Macdonell & Keith; Vedic Index, 1958, Vol. I. page 357.

Iranians developed the sense of 'hostile country,' the conquered country.[226] The word Dasyu or Dahyu originally signifying a particular people inhabiting the Irānāryan world became a common noun meaning a country or people in old Irānian.[227] The Panis and their progenitor Vṛsaya have also been located in Iran. The Paṇis are Parnians of Strabo and the Vṛsaya, the Barsecuties of Arrian.[228] The archaeological excavations in Iran have brought to light a civilization in the earliest period, which only reflexes a civilization developed in a more eastern region on the Irānian plateau A matriarchal society and female inheritance and similar customs of matriarchal origin ruled in Iran. The discovery of Ahis in Iran is also significant. Plate 32 of a nude captive, a kind of Nāga, points towards original India Figure 304 depicts one person with two back and two forehead horns having coiled snakes under his feat The other person is sitting behind him with four horns visible Both of them are covered by a long and large cobra over their heads; the front man catching the mouth of cobra and the third man behind the second horned man catching its tale. Three persons are shown standing infront of the first sitting man or deity or king placing his hand on the cobra. Three men wear long robes. They are followed by 29 men standing with folded hands.[229] The poisonous Ahi under the control of the powerful Lord is depicted as peaceful and non-violent. This figure recalls the three headed, horned powerful Lord in control of the Ahis and other violent animals in a Mohenjodaro figure This Mohenjodaro figure has its counterpart in the Sumerian figure of Ān,[230] a nude figure with horns in control of Ahis Harappa nude figures, the cult objects, have their counterparts in Sumerian nude figures having tridents or horns. Nude figures with

226. Macdonell & Keith; op cit., Vol. I. page 349.

227. Buddhaprakash; Vrtra; A. B. O. R. I. Vol. 30 page 172.

228. Macdonell & Keith, op. cit , Vol I. page 472-473.

229. Ernest E. Herzfled; Iran in the Ancient East, 1941; pages 11, 189-190.

230. H. Heras; Studies in Proto-Indo-Mediterranean culture; 1953; pages 169-171-174, 321-323, 332.

tridents and coiled snake are prominently displayed in ancient Egyptian relics. The Vṛtra of the Ṛgveda is Ahi the great. He is also horned.[231] The Vrtras were also very prominent in Iran. Āryans of Iran also had veretherghna as the Āryans in Bhārata had the Vrtrahan The nude figures and Ahis, in association or separately, have abundantly been found at Mohenjodaro and Harappa. The Harappa culture extended as far as Sutkagendor, near the coast of the Arabian Sea 300 miles west of Karachi. It is situate just on the border of Iran.[232] The culture and civilization of Iran and Bhārata appear very similar in pre-Āryan times. Iran was the Far Western province of Bhārata.

Immigration of Mediterraneans Circa 2800 B. C

The Bhāratīyan Panis of the Ahi sub-race had sea-voyages to Sumer in the early and to Egypt in the middle of the fourth millenium B C, colonised those lands and implanted Bhāratiya culture there.[233] They were anthropologically of the proto-Australoid racial stock.[234] They remained pure pre-Āryan and pre-Dravidian proto-Australoids speaking Munda or Kol speech till the arrival of peasant farmers from the high plateau of Iran[235] These peasant farmers had come from the Mediterranean Sea The contacts of Sumer with the Mediterranean sea and the Panic migrations to Sumer, Egypt and the Ægean accelerated the process of two way traffic. Earlier the migrations had been from the east to the west but in the early part of the third millenium B C., we witness eastward movements of the Mediterranean people. Scarlet ware appears in the Baghdad region having affinities with its predecessor, Jamdat-Nasr pottery. This pottery turns up again at Susa and in south Baluchistan. We witness the

231. Ṛgveda 1. 7. 3. 12.

232. Mortimer Wheeler; The Indus civilization, 1953, pages 2-3 Map on page 3

233. R. C. Jain, The most ancient Āryan society, chapter I sub-chapter 7

234. R. C. Jain; op. cit.; chapter II sub-chapter 6

235 D. H. Gordan. The Pre-Historic Back ground of Indian culture 1958; page 35.

earliest agricultural communities in the region of Baluchistan, Makran and Sindh which show from the beginning links with the ancient Bronze age cultures of the regions of farthest west.[236] These peasant farming communities from the Mediterranean region had as their neighbour the remarkable urban civilization of the Punjab-Sind Rajasthan regions watered by the Saraswatī system These people from the Mediterranean racial stock merged with the pre-existing proto-Australoid racial stock who completely assimilated them. They commingled together in perfect harmony and complete homogeneity Most of the skulls found at Mohenjodaro can be traced to mixture between these racial types.[237] When the Āryans met them in Iran and Bhārata they were all blackskinned (Krsnatvach),[238] of the black Dāsa-Varna [239] The arrival of the Mediterranean racial stock made no difference in the racial constitution of the original proto-Australoid stock. The complete assimilation of the former with the later, made no racial change and the people continued to be of the proto-Australoid racial stock as before when the Āryans first entered the Far Western Province of Bhārata circa 2000 B. C.[240]

Ahi-Nagnas

The Ahis were people of the mountains as the Iksvākus were the people of the plains. They are associated with Nagna people. The Nagna spiritual leaders par excellence were their supreme leaders. The greatest spiritual leaders of Bhārata, Sumer and Egypt; the Śiśnadeva, Ān and Rā respectively, are nude (Nagna) Nudity suggests perfect harmony with nature. Only the very high spiritual personages with no material or sexual desires can be tolerated by the society in their nagna state. The Nagna symbolises the victory of spirit over matter,

236. S. Piggot, Pre-Historic India; 1950, page 60–67.

237. D. N. Majumdar, Races and cultures of India, 1951, page 60–67.

238. Ṛgveda 1. 19. 4. 8; 9. 2. 17. 1.

239. Ṛgveda 2. 2. 14; 2. 2. 9. 7; 7. 1. 5. 3.

240. S. Piggot; op. cit; page 63.

the victory of peace over violence. Nagna is a pacified personality. The Nāga is poison or matter incarnate. He comes nearest to phallus, the matter, the poison of the spirit, incarnate. The Nāga in the presence of Nagna spiritual person becomes pacified, he loses his poison and becomes Ahi, the non-slayer Ahi is Matter pacified. The Nagna personality is the matter pacified. Hence the association of Nagna and Ahis is of great significance to the students of the history of cultures.

The Ahi problem may rightly be understood if we keep the topography of a mountaneous country like Kaśmīra in view The roads, tracks and paths of the mountains are zigzag, curvy and snirling like the Nāgas. The greatest river Vitastā (modern jhelum) of Kaśmīra is not born of the mountaneous snows but of the mountaneous under-land When I saw the Vitastā flowing from under-land at Verinaga, I was simply exhilarated to see the sight It also solved the Ahi problem for me. The river was coming out like a Nāga from its cave. Nāga lores of Kaśmīra as contained in Nīlamātā Purāna depict the destructive power of the Nāgas. One such legend throws light on certain Ahi problems.

Kaśmīra was ruled by Kaśyapa's son Nīla, the king of the Nāgas. No. human beings could live there during winter. One day a Brāhmana Chanderadeva went to his subterranean palace He willed from the Nāga king to allow the people to reside in the region for the whole of the year and he consented.[241] This legend proves that Nāgas were great experts in sub-terranean architecture. They invented the science of the use of under-world waters for irrigational purposes and thus constructed rivers and large bunds. As they were the masters of the zigzag under-land spheres; they came to the regarded as Nāgas whose activities were very similar to theirs. The pacified Nāgas are a boon of humanity. The Mohenjodaro inscriptions reveal the fact that Nāgas in association of the Nagna supreme power are always venerated. Perhaps they derived their name from the Nagna high personages.

241. A. P. Karmarkar; An Farly attempt of the Āryans against the Nāga cult; New Indian Antiquary Vol 5 page 187.

The archaeological evidence of the Nude figure of supreme Deity associated with pacified Ahis is amply corroborated from the Rgveda. The Vrtra is a single Deva[242] and hence he may be regarded as an Ahi par excellence, Ahi the Great. Śiśnadevas were the holy spiritual leaders of the Ayajñic Vrtras or Dasyus.[243] Indra along with the Vrtras and the Dasyus, murdered them also.

Siśnadevas

Who are those Śiśnadevas? Most of the scholars, mis-following Yāska, have understood by the word Śiśnadeva as a phallus worshipper or non-celibate. Yāska etymoliges the word as a brahmacharyāh[244] tracing the word Śiśna to √snath 'to pierce' The analysis and right understanding of 'snath' is necessary before we take up the word Abrahmacharyāh

According to Dr. Prannath, the word Śiśna does not seem to be a Sanskrit word, for there is no possible etymological explanation of it in any Āryan language Dr Prannath reads word "ssnah" on Indus Seal No 80 According to him, the god probably referred to by this word is 'sissna' which is found is Sanskrit literature as 'Śiśna' The Rgvedic Rsis used a corrupted form of the word used by their Dasyu neighbours[245]

The word "Deva" means shining, powerful, the supreme The Ṛgveda is replete of this meaning of the word Deva The word Deva everywhere means "The worshipped," nowhere it does mean "the worshipper" Dr. Pusalkar has cited evidence adduced by V. Bhattarcharya wherein he has tried to prove from later Samhitās that words Mātṛdeva, Pitrdeva, Atithideva, Āchāryadeva and Śrāddhadeva in the Upaniṣads and Strīdeva in the Brahmāṇda-Purāna and Sassudeva in Pali do not mean "Worshipper of' but the word Deva is used in the secondary

242. Ṛgveda 1. 7 2. 12.

243. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 4. 5; 10 8 3. 3.

244. (1) Nirukta 4, 19.

(2) Lakshman Sarup, The Nighantu and the Nirukta, 1967; page 66.

(3) A. A. Macdonell, Vedic Grammer; 1958 page 143.

245. Father Heras; op. cit.; page 32.

or metaphorical sense of 'devoted to or addicted to.' He along with V. Bhattacharya does not accept even the meaning, given to the word, of phallus-worshipper but gives the meaning "one addicted to sexual gratification, lustful, non-celibate." [246] He concludes that their was no phallus-worship in the Indus Valley civilization. These authors are right in holding that the sense of 'worshipper of' does not appear from the Ṛgveda. I also agree with Dr. Pusalkar that there was no phallus-worship prevalent amongst the inhabitants of Indus valley. But the meaning given to the word as non-celibate or sensuous person is also not warranted by the Ṛgveda. But the way in which the word Deva has been divorced from the compound word and prefixed to a silent word is quite-arbitrary. He translates the sentence Pitṛdevo Bhava as 'a person whom the father is just like a god.' [247] But if we take the word Pitṛdevo as one word, which it surely is, then, it should mean 'a person who revers his Pitṛdeva.' The word Deva only qualifies the inherent respect that the father is entitled to from his son and it only lays emphasis upon the qualities of father. Similarly the word Śiśnadevo bhava should mean "a person who revers Śiśnadeva, the nude deva' just like the father-deva, mother-deva, Āchārya-deva and so on and so forth.

The scholars who have given these two interpretations of phallus worship or non-celebacy did not pay attention to the aspect of the word Deva as an object of worship. I need not cite any Ṛc of the Rgveda to prove that gods Indra, Agni, Varuna and others are 'objects of worship; the worshipped' of the Āryan followers and later the Āryan worshippers.

Yāska had led the later scholars to give the word, a meaning of phallus-worshipper. The etymology of this word is obscure. [248] As the word is a corrupted form of some

246. A. D. Pusalkar; Śiśna-deva in the Ṛgveda and Phallus worship in the Indus-Valley; 1954; pages 2, 6.

247. Viddhushekhar Shastri; Vedic Interpretation and Tradition; Proceeding and Transactions of the Sixth All India Oriental Conference, Patna session 1930, page 501.

248. Siddheswar Varma, The Etymologies of Yāska; 1953, page 242, 244.

pre-Āryan word borrowed by the Āryans from their Dasyu adversaries, Yāska only gave a popular and current etymology or he himself misunderstood the etymology inherited by him from his predecessor lexicographers. The Snatha, to pierce in the moral sense, a sense to be given to a Deva, to an object of worship, is to pierce the heart of the follower. The leader has the extraordinary quality of 'piercing' the mind or soul of his followers. If snath is given the ideological meaning of piercing or influencing, the truth unfolds itself. Śiśnadeva would, then, mean that deva who has complete control over his Śiśna, his carnal desires. The punning upon words had been a great Brāhmaṇical virtue. Yāska has used the word Abrahmacharya not in the sense of unchaste or non-celibate, as twisted by later prejudiced pundits, but in the sense of "one who does not follow the Brahma way." The Brahma way is no doubt, the Yajña way. The Ayajñic leaders of the Brahmāryan adversaries did not subscribe to faith to the institutions of Yajña and of Brahma; hence they were Abrahmacharyas. Yāska himself was in a dilemma. He gives both the moral and the material senses to the word. Perhaps the historical sense of the word "Abrahmacharyāḥ" had become obscure in his age. But the word "Abrahma' used in a different context gives some corroboration to our interpretation. Dasyu, in this Ṛc, has been called 'Abrahmā' devoid of the Brahma way or the Vedic or the Yajñic way. Sāyaṇa also lends support to this interpretation. [249] Abrahmā here means non-Brahmā. Brahmā is that priest who follows Vedic injunctions. Abrahmā is he who does not follow Vedic injunctions. Similarly Abrahmacharyāḥ are those persons who do not follow the Brahma way of conduct or injunctions. Śiśnadevāḥ, in simple grammatical sense, mean only "nude gods." The word has been given a hostile interpretation by the hostile invaders who did not and could not, at that stage of their civilization and culture, adore such a spiritual institution. This sort of hostile interpretation was rather a curt

---

249. (1) Ṛgveda 4. 2. 6. 9.
(2) Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā (V. S. M.) Vol. 2. page 565.

manner of abusing the gods of the indigenous people of India.[250] Śiśnadeva was the supreme god of the Nāgas or the Ahi people; the Dāsas and Dasyus who were destroyed by Indra.[251] We meet here also only an abusive interpretation.

Avaidic Spiritual Lords

These Śiśnadevas were the supreme spiritual personages whom the pre-Āryan Bhāratīyans paid their highest reverences. They were saints or Munis par excellence. The association of the people with them made the people peaceful and non-violent. Their followers in the mountains derived their names from their Nagna-ship; the spiritualism par excellence. They became the Nagnas. They were Ahis, the non-slayers. The close association of the Ahi people with their Nagna supreme spiritual lords; as depicted in the Ṛgveda and as found in material relics unearthed from archaeological mounds of various pre-historic sites; gave them their racial epithet Nagna. Nagna means Avaidic.[252] Nagnas, by and by, became the Nāgas of history.

The Ahi race basically opposed the Āryan Yajñic way. Varuna is invoked to exterminate the non-sacrificers. Agni is invoked to confound the Dasyus who are riteless, unbelievers, non-honouring and non-sacrificers.[253] Indra chastised and drove far the non-sacrificers.[254] Brahmaṇaspati appropriates the food (wealth) of the non-sacrificers for the sacrificers. Indra is offered soma libation because he holds respect for wealth and plunders the wealth of the non-sacrificers.[255] The sacrificers overcome the non-sacrificers.[256] Mitra and Varuṇa are to keep the non-sacrificers without male progeny.[257] Indra

250. A. P. Karmarkar; Fresh and Further Light on the Mohenjodaro Riddle; ABORI Vol. 21 page 122.

251. A. P. Karmarkar; op. cit.; N. I. A. Vol. 5 page 185.

252. A. D. Pusalkar studies in Epics and Purāṇas; 1955, page LXII.

253. Ṛgveda 6. 6. 6. 9; 7. 1. 6. 3.

254. Ṛgveda 1. 19. 5. 4; 1. 18. 1. 13.

255. Ṛgveda 1. 15. 10. 6.

256. Ṛgveda 8. 5. 1. 15–18.

257. Ṛgveda 7. 4. 6. 4.

killed the Dasyu and the opposers of sacrifice perished. The opposers of sacrifice contending with the sacrificers, fled with averted faces. Indra blew off the non-sacrificers.[258] Dasyus follow the religion opposed to the Āryans, are against the Āryan Devas and are non-sacrificers.[259] The Ahi people were non-sacrificers and their associates in Dāśarājña war and especially the Pañchajanāḥ; the Pūrus, the Yadus, the Turvaśas, the Anus and the Druhyus were also non-sacrificers.[260]

Prākṛta Language

These non-sacrificing Ahi and Ikṣvāku people were Mṛdhravāchaḥ and Vadhrivāchaḥ. They spoke a language hostile to or opposed to the Āryans. They spoke a non-Āryan language. The Vṛtras are Mṛdhravāchaḥ.[261] The Dasyus are Mṛdhravāchaḥ[262] Śruta, Kavaṣa, Vṛddha, the Druhyu and the Anu are Mṛdhravāchaḥ.[263] The Pūrus are Mṛdhravāchaḥ.[264] All the enemies of Sudās andIndra in the Dāśarājña war are Vadhrivāchaḥ.[265] The word Anāsa occurs with the word Mṛdhravāchaḥ [266] As discussed earlier, it means that the language of the Mrdhrvāchaḥ people had very little use of nasal sounds as in Prākṛts. The word, in this context, has no reference to nose, the limb of the human body. It qualifies the word signifying the language of the Dasyus. The main dividing line of the language of the Brahmāryans and their adversaries was the use of "l" for "r."[267] It appears that the Dasyus spoke some form of Ancient Prākṛta now lost to humanity.

We, thus, find that Ahi was the great sub-race inhabiting the western and the far western provinces of Bhārata, especially

258. Ṛgveda 1. 7. 3. 4–5.
259. Ṛgveda 8. 8. 1. 11.
260. Ṛgveda 7. 5. 13 7.
261. Ṛgveda 1. 23. 10. 2, 5. 2. 18. 8.
262. Ṛgveda 5. 2. 15. 10; 7. 1. 6. 3.
263. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1. 12. 13.
264. Ṛgveda 10. 2. 7. 5; 7. 2. 1. 13.
265. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1. 9.
266. Ṛgveda 5. 2. 15. 10.
267. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 3. 2. 1. 23–24.

in mountaneous regions, before the Āryan invasions. They were not the Asuras, the kinsmen of the Āryans but their staunch adversaries. They had their political, administrative defensive, social and economic organisations respectively known as Dāsī, Vṛtra, Rakṣas, Dāsa and Paṇi classes. The people of racial Ahi stock were the real inhabitants, the Dasyus of their mother-land; the Bhārata. The Ahi society had only functional classifications in the beginning. In course of time some separate tribes of the Ahi race sprang. Some kindred tribes had very close and deep associations with the Ahi race. The Ahi race played a very important role in Bhāratīya history since earliest times.

CHAPTER IV

THE PAÑCHAJĀTĀḤ

1. FIVE PEOPLES

The word jana has been generally used in the Ṛgveda in the sense of a hostile person or hostile people. Pañchajanāḥ denote five peoples or five republics of the Brahmāryan adversaries, the Pūrus, the Yadus, the Turvaśa the Anus and the Druhyus. The territorial boundaries of these five Republics were known as Pañchakṣitis. [1] They are racially referred to in the Ṛgveda as Pañchajātāḥ. The words Pañchajanāḥ, Pañchakṣitīnām and Pañchajātāḥ denote respectively the political, territorial and racial designations of the people inhabiting the region. These Pañchajātāh people resided on the banks of Saraswatī. [2] These five tribes inhabiting the jana repdublics of Bhārata are the Pūrus, the Yadus, the Turvaśas, the Anus and the Druhyus. The Saraswatī, along with seven sister rivers, joined the sea in that age. The Pūrus inhabited the northern region in the Punjab; the Anus and the Druhyus in the middle region in Rajasthan and Sindh and the Yadus and Truvaśas in the southern region of Sindh extending upto the sea coasts, on both the sides of the banks of Saraswatī. These five tribes constituted an important element of the Bhāratiya people before the Brahmāryan invasions and they played a very important role in opposing the invaders.

2. THE PŪRUS

The People

We have earlier noticed that the adventurous people of the Mediterranean racial stock had come in large numbers through the land routes of West Asia and settled in Bhārata

1. R. C. Jain, The Most Ancient Āryan Society, 1964; chapter I sub-chapter V.
2. Ṛgveda 6. 6. 12. 12.

by the side of the prosperous cities. They were assimilated by the original proto-Australoid population. They completely merged in the local population and adopted their culture and civilizations, customs and manners, art and architecture. They became one with the people. They were the most virile section of the community. These people who came to Bhārata in the first part of the third millennium B.C. came in large numbers. They began to be called Pūrus on account of their large numbers. This name, in course of time, came to signify this distinct group. These people became the Pūrus of history. They became widespread over the whole western and far-western regions of Bhārata. Pūru means much, abundant, manifold.[3]

Purūravas

When the Brahmāryan military forces advanced from west to Bhārata in the east from their homeland in West Asia; they met the Pūrus along with the Ahis in initial stages. When they first met them in the hilly tracts of northern Bhārata, Purūravas was their most important leader. Purūravas is a compound word formed of Pūru and Ravas. Pūru means much, abundant. Rava means roar; thunder. Purūravas means crying much or loudly.[4] The word is traced to Puru + $\sqrt{}$Ru, lit, one who cries a great deal.[5] This word is used in this

3 Ṛgveda 1. 11. 5. 10; 1. 13. 8. 7; 1. 17. 2. 9; 1. 19. 1. 3; 1. 20. 6 10; 1. 21. 3. 10; 1. 21. 5. 4; 1. 21. 11. 1; 1. 23. 2. 3; 1. 23. 2. 13; 1. 24. 12. 9; 2. 2. 5. 3; 3. 3. 2. 15; 3. 4. 13. 5; 3. 5. 5. 5; 4. 3. 7. 3; 4. 3 10. 8; 4. 4. 5. 8; 4. 5. 10. 9; 5. 1. 2. 4; 5. 1. 3. 4; 5. 1. 9. 4; 5. 2. 9. 3; 5. 3. 1. 4, 5. 3. 5. 3, 5. 6. 1. 1; 5. 6. 1. 2; 6. 2. 1. 5; 6. 2. 3. 13; 6. 6. 1. 2; 6. 6. 2. 8; 7. 4. 7. 1; 7. 5. 11. 3; 7. 6. 3. 7; 8. 1. 1. 22; 8. 1. 2. 32; 8. 1. 4. 1; 8. 3. 4. 7; 8. 4. 3. 27; 8. 4. 5. 16. 8. 5. 9. 7; 8. 5. 11. 5; 8. 7. 1. 14; 8. 7. 2. 8; 8. 9. 3. 3; 9. 9. 12. 9; 9. 1. 15. 2; 9. 3. 2. 2.

4. Monier Williams; Sanskrit-English Dictionary; 1956; pages 636-868.

5. Yāska 10. 46.

6. Ṛgveda 1. 7. 1. 4.

literal sense in the Ṛgveda as an epithet of Manu.[6] Apart from legends, it means "a most renowned Pūru." Purūravas may not be the actual name of the most renowned Pūru leader. It appears only to be his epithet. The Purāṇic legend says that Purūravas had declared war on the Brāhmaṇas, robbed them of their jewels and coveted the golden sacrificial floor of the Naimisa sages, who were performing sacrifices. The sages in revenge killed him. [7] Shorn off Purānic travesties, the legend simply means that Purūravas was an adversary of the Brahmāryans and their most important institution, the Yajña. The Pūrus under Purūravas met the Brahmāryan forces under Agni. Agni overcame the Pūrus in battle.[8] Purūravas even then did not submit. Urvaśī, the Brahmāryan Miss Universe, was ambassadored to entice and win over him to their side. She performed this task quite admirably. Purūravas after his historical itinerary to the Āryan cradle-land Uttarakuru through Himalayan, Meru and other mountaineous regions and Harivarṣa and other countries, returned with her to the Brahmāryan military posts in Gandhāra and was converted there to the Brahmāryan fold. He was initiated to the Yajñic way to fight his own kinsmen in Gandhāra. [9]

Āyu

Purāṇas give Āyu, Nahuṣa and Yayāti as the descendants of Purūravas. *Āyu is a very unimportant figure in the Ṛgveda.* Indra made Āyu, along with Kutsa and Atithigva, subject to the mighty youthful Suśravas. Indra destroyed the assailants of Āyu. Indra quickly humbled and gave Dasyu, to the Ārya. [10] He married Prabhā, the daughter of Dānava Svarbhānu. [11] Āyu was a Dasyu who belonged to the Ahi race having matrimonial alliance with Dānavas, also of the Ahi race.

7. A. D. Pusalkar; Traditional History from the Earliest Times (in Vedic Age); 1957; page 273.
8. Ṛgveda 7. 1. 8. 4.
9. R. C. Jain; op. cit.; (M. A. A. S.); pages 126–127.
10. Ṛgveda 1 10. 3. 10; 2. 2. 3 7; 6. 2. 3. 3.
11. F. E. Pargiter; Ancient Indian Historical Tradition; 1962; page 306.

Nahuṣa

Nahuṣa is the name of a minor person or tribe in the Ṛgveda. Nahuṣas appear along with Pañchakṣitīnām. They, thus, become associated with Saraswatī region. Saraswatī, chiefest and purest of rivers, flowing from the mountains to the ocean, understood the request of Nahusa and distributing riches among the many existing beings, milked for him butter and water.[12] Indra recognised the Nahuṣa people or descendants of the Nahuṣa people. Indra gave benefits to Varṣagiras after looting Dasyus and Simyus. Indra divided the fields amongst his white-complexioned friends.[13] Nothing was given to Nahusas. Agni baffled the devices of his adversaries and coerced the Nahuṣa people (Nahuṣa Viśaḥ).[14] Indra destroyed the seven cities of the Nahuṣa people.[15] Nahuṣa people also appear with Dasyus.[16] Nahuṣa married his sister (Pitṛ-Kanyā) Virajā and had six or seven sons by her[17] Simyus people were a member of the Ten-Republics confederacy against Sudās and are coupled with Dasyus.[18] Nahuṣa was a son of Kaśyapa and Kadrū.[19] The descendants of Kadrū from Kaśyapa, like Arbuda, are known as Kādraveyas on account of the matrilineal system of inheritance. Matriarchy never obtained amongst the Āryans. They had always, from the very beginning upto the present times, followed the patriarchal system. The descendants of Kadrū are known as Nāgas. Nahuṣa, thus, appears to have belonged to the Ahi race, Purānic tradition makes Nahuṣa also a son of Āyu. That is an abrupt change. This is another glaring instance of falification of history by the Brāhmaṇic priests.

12. Ṛgveda 7. 6. 6. 2; 6. 4 3. 7.
13. Ṛgveda 1. 15. 7. 16-18.
14. Ṛgveda 7. 1. 6. 5.
15. Ṛgveda 10. 4. 7. 8.
16. Ṛgveda 10. 8. 9. 7.
17. F. E. Pargiter; Ancient Indian Historical Tradition; 1962; page 86.
18. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1. 5; 1. 15. 7. 18.
19. Mahābhārata (Cr. ed.) 1. 31. 9.

Kādraveya Nahuṣa was a staunch opponent of animal food while the Brahmāryans remained beef-eaters till seventh century B. C, [20] still Nahuṣa Nāga was transformed into Nahuṣa Ārya. Nahuṣas had close connections with the Dasyus and their social way. Nahuṣa people were of the Ahi race.

Yayāti

Nahuṣa had six or seven sons from his sister-wife amongst whom Yati and Yayāti were the most important. Yayāti appears only twice in the Ṛgveda. He is associated with Manu in one hymn. [21] Manu was the progenitor of ritualised sacrifices after Dāśarājña war. Yayāti, therefore, appears to be an obscure late figure. He had been given the fatherhood of Nahusa[22] when the Tenth Maṇḍala of the Rgveda was appended to the main Book circa 800 B. C. Yayāti married Devayānī; daughter of Uśanas-Śukra, the high priest of Dānavas and Daityas. He also married Śarmiṣṭhā, daughter of Dānava Vṛsaparvan. [23] Yayāti of the Ahi race had his matrimonial relations with Dānavas and Daityas, also of the Ahi race All the Purānic traditions ascribe the fatherhood of Pūru, Yadu, Turvaśā, Anu and Druhyu to Yayāti

Fabrication of Genealogy

The Purānas unanimously make Purūravas the ancestor of the above five tribes. The genealogical table given is Purūravas; Āyu; Nahuṣa; Yayāti.[24] But the Ṛgveda does not know of any such relationship. None of these persons have any sort of connection with one or the other. This geneology was fabricated several hundred years after the actual historical events to suit the Brāhmanic purposes of the changed times.

Purukutsa and Trasadasyu

The Ṛgveda knows two very important Pūrus; Purukutsa and Trasadasyu. Purukutsa was son of Durgahā and father of

20. V. M. Apte, The Age of Ṛc-Saṁhitā (in Vedic Age); 1957; page 520.

21. Ṛgveda 1. 7. 1. 17.

22. Ṛgveda 10. 5. 3. 1.

23. Mahābhārata (Cr. Ed.) 1. 90. 8–9.

24. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit.; pages 144–145.

Trasadasyu. [25] Purukutsa was made a prisoner of war, [26] probably in the Dāśarājña war, and he appears to have died in captivity. His wife Purukutsānī gave birth to Trasadasyu through the favour of Indra and Varuṇa. [27] Trasadasyu, thus, appears to be the posthumous son of Purukutsa. [28] Varuṇa and Indra were living leaders of the Brahmāryan forces in that age. Indra had won the Dāśarājña war and the supreme hero of Dāśarājña confederacy. Purukutsa, had been murdered. Varuṇa was a peaceful man. The lustful Indra took to concubinage the widow of Purukutsa and Trasadasyu was born of their physical union. Trasadasyu, thus, appears to be the levirate son of Purukutsa from Indra on Purukutsānī. Purukutsa and Trasadasyu are Pūrus. [29]

It appears that after the destruction of Pūru power by Agni, both entered into mutual treaty and became allies. Purukutsa, in his youthful days, helped Indra in his historic battles against the Vṛtras. Indra destroyed the Vṛtra power for the sake of youthful Purukutsa. [30] Purukutsa, perhaps, got the booty of war. Indra, warring on behalf of Purukutsa, overturned the seven cities. Indra cut off for Sudās the wealth of Anhas and gave it to him. [31] Indra shattered seven cities of Śāradī Dāsī and gave the spoils to Purukutsa. [32] Aśvins preserved Purukutsa. [33] Purukutsa son of Durgahā belonged to the line of Girikṣita. [34] The Brahmāryan invaders were successful in the beginning in sowing the seeds of disunity amongst the Bhāratīya people. Indra, the progenitor of the Āryan policy of Divide and Rule, won many Bhāratīyans to

25. Ṛgveda 4. 4. 10. 8-9; 5. 3. 1. 8; 8. 3. 7. 36.
26. Ṛgveda 4. 4. 10. 8.
27. Ṛgveda 4. 4. 10. 9.
28. (1) H. H. Wilson; Ṛgveda; 1926; Vol. III pages 366-367.
(2) A. C. Das; Ṛgvedic culture; 1925; page 354.
29. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 2. 3.
30. Ṛgveda 1. 23. 10. 2.
31. Ṛgveda 1. 11. 6. 7.
32. Ṛgveda 6. 2. 5. 10.
33. Ṛgveda 1. 16. 7. 7.
34. Ṛgveda 5. 3. 1. 8.

play the role of fifth columnists. Purukutsa was a favourite of Indra. But the truth soon dawned upon him. Indra was strengthening the military forces of the Brahmāryan invaders under the commander-ship of Sudās. Purukutsa saw the Brahmāryan game. When Viśvāmitra organised the Dāśarājña confederacy, he was prevailed upon to join the confederacy against Sudās and in the war that followed he was probably taken prisoner and died in captivity. [35]

Pūrus now had fallen from the Brahmāryan favour. Aśvins, the preserver of Purukutsa previously, now discomfited them.[36] Indra thinned his enemies in battle and conducted the Dāsa at his pleasure. He plundered the wealth of his adversaries. He turns away from him who offers no libation. Pūru-jana is involved in great difficulty on provoking the might of Indra to wrath. [37] Pūru-jana refers to the Pūru republic, a constituent of Pañchaksitīnāṁ. The azur-chinned Indra, the giver of wealth and possessing unequalled strength, destroyed the Pūrus, the Vṛtras and the Dasyus. [38] Indra in the exhilaration of Soma, destroyed the Pūrus and the Vṛtras.[39] Indra quickly demolished in Dāśarājña war all the strongholds and seven cities of his adversaries He gave the dwelling of the son of Anu to Tṛtsu and proceeded to conquer the Mṛdhravāchaḥ Pūru. [40] The Pūru-Jana or Pūru republic was situate on the northern Punjab regions on both the banks of Saraswatī. [41] Pūrus had become affluent on both the banks of Saraswatī. [42] The Purāṇas make Allahabad, the original habitat of the Pūrus. That was simply impossible. The Purāṇas fabricated

35. A. C. Das; op. cit.; page 355.
36. Ṛgveda 5. 6. 2. 8.
37. Ṛgveda 5. 3. 2. 6. 7.
38 Ṛgveda 6. 3. 6. 6.
39. Ṛgveda 6. 4. 1. 14.
40. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1. 13.
41. R. C. Majumdar & A D. Pusalkar; Vedic Age; 1957; Map of Ancient India on page 545.
42. Ṛgveda 7. 6. 7. 2.

the myth of the Pūru seat at Allahabad, on the Purāṇic versions current about 300 A. D. [43]

Pūru Trasadasyu was born of the mixed Brahmāryan-Bhāratīyan blood. He carried on extensive wars in exterminating his own kinsmen, the Dasyus. Heaven and Earth gave him weapons for the destruction of the Dasyus. He was Agni's favour. Aśvins protected him in war. Indra helped him in battles for the possession of the earth. Aśvins helped him in the acquisition of wealth. He became a liberal donor. He gave five hundred Vadhūs to Ṛṣi Śobhari and ten bright horses to Ṛṣi Saṁvarna. He was Ardha-deva, [44] the half god as only half of his blood was of an Āryan god, the Indra. Trasadasyu son of Purukutsa was still a Pūru. Later on his descendants, coalescing with the Tṛtsus and other constituents of the Bharata race gave birth to the Kuru tribe. [45]

Ayājñics

The Pūrus, like other constituents of the Dāśarājña confederacy were non-sacrificers. [46] They were Mṛdhravāchaḥ and Vadhrivāchāḥ,[47] speeking the Ancient Prākṛta, the hostile speech, unknown to the Brahmāryans. The Pūrus had associations with the Vṛtras, the Dasyus, the Dāsas and other members of the Dāśarājña confederacy. They belonged to the Ahi sub-race.

The people of the Ahi race, as observed later, were transferred the epithet Asura, in a bad sense by the end of the Ṛgvedic age. These Pūrus have been called Asura-Rākṣasa during the Śatapatha age circa 600 B. C. The Śatapatha Brāhmana knows that Pūru, by name, was an Asura-Rākṣasa. [48] Agni

43. C. V. Vaidya, Solar and Lunar Kṣatriya Races in the Vedas I. B. B. R. P. S. Vol. 23 (1914–15) page 48.

44. Ṛgveda 4. 4. 6. 1; 5. 2. 13. 3; 1. 16. 7. 14; 8. 3. 7. 36; 7. 2. 2. 3; 8. 2. 3. 21; 8. 5. 6. 7; 8. 5. 7. 7; 5. 3. 1. 8; 4. 4. 10. 8–9.

45. R. C. Jain; Origin of the Kuru Tribe, Jain Bhāratī Research Number; 1963; page 11.

46. Ṛgveda 7. 5. 13 7.

47. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1. 13; 10. 2. 7. 5.

48. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 6. 8. 1. 14.

overthrew him in battles. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa recalls the truth, with approval contained in the Ṛgvedic Ṛch 7. 1. 8. 4. The association of the word Rākṣasa with Asura still preserves the memory of the Pūru tribe having descended from the Ahi race. But Purukutsa, the Pūru, is also called an Aikṣvāka in the same Brāhmaṇa.[49] This reference raises a historical problem.

Purāṇas do not know any Purukutsa or Trasadasyu belonging to the Pūru tribe. Purukutsa and Trasadasyu, as father and son respectively, appear in the Iksvāku dynasty.[50] Who were these Aiksvāka Pūrus then ?

Pūru-Ikṣvāku Contacts

Pūru's grandson Prāchinvant[51] conquered the East. He is contemporary of Aikṣvāka Yuvanāśva I The Pūrus were living on the banks of the Saraswatī; hence their eastern expedition must have been against the Aikṣvāka supremacy. Then a great Aikṣvāka Kuvalāśva arose. His Paurava contemporary was Sudhanvān-Dhundhu.[52] He was son of Dānava Madhu and an opponent of animal food.[53] Kuvalāśva killed this Rākṣasa, Daitya and Dānava Dhundhu, near a sand-filled sea. The Saraswatī had flown into sea in that age.[54] Kuvalāśva had to cross the whole Rajasthan desert to the mouth of Saraswatī. He killed him on the sea-shore. It appears reasonably certain that Pūru supremacy extended through the whole region watered by Saraswatī system. This Sudhanvān-Dhundhu is a Pūru and a Rākṣasa. When Dhundhu was vanquished or killed; his sister, daughter of Dānava Madhu, was married to Haryaśva I from whom the Yadus sprang.[55]

49. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 13. 5. 4. 5.
50. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit.; page 145.
51. Mahābhārata (Cr. Ed.) 1. 90. 12–13.
52. F. E. Pargiter, op. cit.; pages 144–145.
53. Mahābhārata (Cr. Ed.) 3. 193. 16; Mahābhārata (Gita Press) Anuśāsan Parva.
54 F. E. Pargiter; op. cit.; page 260.
55. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit.; page 122.

The earliest Pūru-Ikṣvāku contacts, according to Purāṇic tradition, occur in the age of Pūru son of Yayāti on his marriage with Kauśalyā, presumably an Aikṣvākī. His son Janamejaya married Anantā, a daughter or descendant of Madhu, whose descendant was Sudhanvan-Dhundhu ? It appears that Madhu and his descendants formed a part of Pūru group till Yadu was born of Ikṣvāku-Madhu blood. It might be possible that Prāchinvant having descended from a Mādhavī might have himself been called a Madhu. His military raids on the eastern Ikṣvāku kingdom of Ayodhyā might have flared Ikṣvāku opposition. The Iksvākus might have remained silent during the age of Madhu. They appear to have retaliated during Dhundhu's time and defeating him, also won his sister. But beyond Pūru's age, we do not find any recorded Ikṣvāku Ahi contacts. But one thing has become very clear. We find Pūru republic and Pūru territory in the the Ṛgveda but we do not find any Pūru dynasty in the Ṛgveda. The Pūrus are just only a constituent of the Pañcha-jātāḥ; the collectivity of five tribes. They might have won special distinctions amongst the Ahi race and formed one separate Pañcha-Jātāḥ group but the separate tribes as such are still not visible. They are all post-Vedic phenomena. The Ahi race, including the Pañchajātāḥ, was still unitary and undivided in spite of some separate groups assuming distinct territorial names.

Ahis and Ahisthala

When we enter recorded history in the Ṛgveda, though in a mutilated form, we find the Ahi dynasty pre-dominating. Sudās and Indra fought the last battles of Dāśarājña war on the banks of the Yamuna against Ajas, Śigrus and Yakṣas under the leadership of Ahi Bheda.[56] The capital of the Ahis was Ahisthala which in Janamejaya's times became Āsandīvat. Āsandīvat is equated with Ahisthala by Kāśikā.[57] Janamejaya is placed in the ninth century B. C.[58] having his royal seat at

56. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1. 19.
57. V. S. Aggarwal; India as Known to Pāṇini 1953; page 71.
58. H. C. Roychowdhari; Political History of Ancient India 1950; page 36.

Āsandīvat.[59] This name continued its existence till Pāṇini's time circa 450 B. C. The Ahis were also known as Nāgas. The Brāhmana priests played pun upon the word Nāga which was given the meaning of elephant also along with Ahi. Pānini gives the word Nāga for Hastin.[60] In the Brāhmaṇas and Upanisads, the words Hastin [61] and Nāga [62] both have been used. Pānini uses the word Hāstinapura [63] for the first time. Pānini flourished during middle of the fifth century B. C.[64] It appears that Hāstinapura was known as Ahisthala till 800 B. C. and as Ānsandīvat till 450 B. C. when its new name, Hāstinapura began to force its way. Mahābhāratic bards further punned upon the word Nāga and changed Ahisthala or Āsandīvat or Hāstinapura into Nāgapur, Nāga-sāhvaya, Gajapura, Gajāhva and Gaja-Sāhvaya between 200 B. C. and 200 A. D.

Thus the earliest name of Hāstinapura appears to be Ahisthala. The Purānic tradition makes always Hastinapur, the capital of the Pauravas. Paurava was always applied to the main branch at Hastināpura.[65] Whatever the later transferences and transpositions have made of historical events, it appears quite certain that Pūrus were Ahis and were associated with Ahisthala till Dāśarājña war.

Aikṣvāka Ahis

Though the Pūrus are much exalted in the Purānas, their Ahi parentage had never been foregiven. The Purāṇas contain a

59. (1) Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 8. 21.
(2) Śatapatha Brāhmana 13. 5. 4. 2.
(3) Pāṇini 8. 2. 12.
60 Pānini 2. 1. 62
61. (1) Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 3. 1. 3. 4; 14. 8. 15. 11; 14. 7. 1. 20.
(2) Aitareya Brāhmana 4. 1; 6. 27.
62. (1) Śatapatha Brāhmana 14. 4. 1. 24.
(2) Aitareya Brāhmana 8. 22.
(3) Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad; 1. 3. 22.
63. Pāṇini 6. 2. 101.
64. V. S. Aggarwal; op. cit.; page 74.
65. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit.; page 274.

Preface where the Sūta gives a full account of the Kali age, the accounts of the Aila and the Ikṣvāku dynasties. There is a curious anachronism in this preface about the Aila dynasty. Under the Aila dynasty, the genealogy of the Paurava kings is given. Pargiter equates Ailas with Pauravas.[66] But the Pauravas have been declared in this very preface as descended from the Mlechchha race. The Pauravas could not both be the Āryans and the non-Āryans as the word Mlechchha, unlike the word Asura, solely and definitely indicates the non-Āryan. The scholars so far as I know have offered no solution of this riddle. History explains this riddle. The Pūrus, a part of Bhāratas, along with other constituents of the Dāśarājña confederacy had coalesced with the Tṛtsus to form the new hybrid Kuru tribe. But all the Pauravas had not been converted to the Brahmāryan fold. Those who joined the Brahmāryans were extolled as of high blood. The rest continued to be decried as the Mlechchhas. The reference to the Mlechachha Pauravas along with the Mlechchha Kośalas (Ikṣvākus) and Dasyu Śavaras, the descendants of Dasyu-chief Viśwāmitra; only betray the Brāhmanic sub-conscious reminiscences about these peoples having belonged to the non-Āryan Iksvāku race and the Ahi sub-race. The Pūrus of the Ṛgvedic Pañcha-jātāḥ were the Aiksavāka Ahis.

3. THE YADUS

Sea-Faring Yadus and Turvaśas

The second most important constituent of the Pañchajātāḥ were the Yadus. In their most important deeds, they appear usually associated with the Turvaśas. They were a Jana republic amongst the Pañchajanāḥ holding territory amongst Pañcha-Kṣitis. Their republic was known as Yādva-jana.[67] The Yadu and the Turvaśa people were the sea-faring people and good navigators.[68] They occupied the southern and the south-western portion of Saraswati region including north-west

66. E. E. Pargiter; The Purāṇa Texts of the Dynasties of Kali age; 1962; pages 2-3, 65.

67. Ṛgveda 8. 2. 1. 48.

68. A. C. Das; Ṛgvedic culture; 1925; page 353.

Rajasthan and Sindh territories extending upto the mouth of the Saraswati, close to the sea-shore.[69] West to the mouth of Saraswati flourished the international sea-port city of Sutkagendor which was under the control of the people who were masters of this part of the Harappan state. Nearest people to them were the Yadus and the Turvaśas; hence it appears all the more probable that Yadus and Turvaśas, the masters of sea-borne trade and expert navigators, extended their decentralised republican system upto Sutkagendor on the borders of Iran and Gedrosia.

Archaeological Evidence

Sutkagendor could not have easily been surrendered by Yadus and Turvaśas as it was the life-line of their foreign trade. A well fought naval battle must have been waged here by the contending forces in which the Bhāratīya forces seem to have been annihilated by the foreign Brahmāryan invaders. The battle-ships of the Yadus and Turvaśas were drowned by the naval forces of Indra who inflicted large-scale casualties on them. But Indra seems to have been very much pleased by the naval power, adventurous spirit and the qualities of organisation of his adversaries and he, a shrewd politician, planned to make them his allies. He brought the drowning Yadus and Turvaśas, having crossed the ocean, safe to the sea shore so that he may know something of the country he was in near future to conquer for the sake of wealth.[70] Jiwanry people who were very near to the Sutkagendor people must have come to their assistance and shared the same fate. After its destruction, it was occupied by the Brahmāryan invaders. We find the cemetries of the Brahmāryan war-lords at Jiwanry dated circa 1100–1000 B. C.[71] Not only the Yadus and Turvaśas of the sea-shore were defeated; the Yadus and Turvaśas, living in the upper mountaneous and plain regions, as allies of

69. Ṛgveda 6. 2. 5. 12; 4. 3. 9. 17.
70. Ṛgveda 6. 5. 12. 5 and several others.
71. S. Piggot; Pre-historic India; 1950; Page 240–156.

Śambara, were also defeated by Divodāsa and Indra. Indra for Divodāsa overturned the cities of Śambara, Yadus and Turvaśas.[72] Indra now had completely won over the Yadus and Turvaśas on the west of the mouth of the Saraswatī in plains and mountains and on the sea. He made his vanquished adversaries his friends.[73] He extended his protection to them.[74] Aświns cemented the alliance forged by Indra with the Yadus and Turvaśas. They sojourned with the Yadus and Turvaśas along with Anus and Druhyus. They also accepted their superiority.[75] Yadus and Turvaśas were upgraded and placed at par with the second Brahmāryan commander-in-chief—Agni to fight against their own kinsmen, the Dasyus[76] Yadus, the former kinsmen and allies of Śambara, helped Indra in demolishing the cities of Śambara.[77] The Yadus and the Turvaśas along with the Pūrus, the Anus and the Druhyus were later permitted to drink Soma with Indra and Agni.[78] The Yadus and the Turvaśas helped Indra in overcoming Ahnavāyya in battle.[79] The shrewd politician Indra had permitted the lands of the Yadus and the Turvaśas which was rendered agreeable to them by fertilizing waters, to be retained by them Indra might have got their assistance against Śuṣṇa, Kutsa and Uśanas[80] Great and glorious Indra was much lauded by his followers for winning the might of the Yadus and the Turvasas against their own kinsmen. The progenitor and past-master in the state art of Divide and Win and then Rule, Indra practically exhibited his supreme political wisdom in the case of the Yadus and the Turvaśas.[81]

---

72. Ṛgveda 9. 3. 1. 2.
73. Ṛgveda 6 4. 2. 1.
74. Ṛgveda 8. 2. 2. 18; 1. 23. 10. 9.
75. Ṛgveda 8. 2. 4. 14; 8. 2. 5. 5.
76. Ṛgveda 1. 8. 1. 18.
77. Ṛgveda 1. 10. 4. 6.
78. Ṛgveda 1. 16. 3. 8.
79. Ṛgveda 8. 6. 3. 27.
80. Ṛgveda 6. 2. 17. 8.
81. Ṛgveda 8. 1. 4. 7.

Constituents of Dāśarājña confederacy

But Yadus soon learnt the political game of Indra and fell out from him. Divodāsa Atithigva's military expeditions had not yet come to a final close; his military forces were still advancing to the east from the regions of Arachosia and Gedrosia. The Yadus and the Turvaśas turned against their present allies and former adversaries the Brahmāryans. They also suffered humiliation at the hands of Indra [82] They finally confederated with their Bhāratīya kinsmen under the leadership of Viśwāmitra in Dāśarājña confederacy against Sudās in which the Bhāratīya military opposition to the foreign invaders was finally offered and crushed.

Ahi Yadus

The Yadus and the Turvasas were the original non-Āryan Bhāratīya people They have been referred as Dāsas [83] like other Brahmāryan adversaries The Epics and Purānas call them Asuras, an epithet applied to Dānavas, Daityas, Raksas and others of the Ahi subrace in post-vedic period, and class them with the tribes of north-west and west among the Nichyas and Apāchyas; [84] i.e. the low and undigestible people In the post-Vedic period, we find Sātvants and Haihayas as the branches of the Yadu tribe. Vītihotras, Bhojas, Śaryātas, Avantis, Tuṇḍikaras and Tālajanghas were the branches of the Haihayas. The Yadus are considered as Vrātyas. [85] Manu considers Sātvata Yadus as Vrātyas. [86] Manusmṛti was probably composed not later than 200 A D [87] Vītihotras were thought of as foreigners in the Vāyupurāna and the king of the Avantis as Vrātya and the people mostly

82. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 2. 8.

83. Ṛgveda 10. 5 2. 10

84. A. D. Pusalkar, Traditions History from the Earliest Times to the Accession of Parikṣita (in Vedic Age), 1957, page 316.

85. H. C. Roychowdhari, Political History of Ancient India, 1950, page 142.

86. Manusmṛti; 10. 23.

87. A. A. Macdohell, History of Sanskrit Literature; 1958; page 428.

Sūdras. Purāṇic preface dubbs the Yadus (Vītihotras) as of Mlechchha race. [88]

Origin of the Yadus

Purāṇas give origin of the Yadus, and also the Turvaśas, from Devayānī and Yayāti. But Harivaṁsa strikes an interesting dissenting note. It says that Madhu was a king who reigned from Madhuvana on the river Yamunā to Surāṣṭra and Āvarta (Gujerat). His daughter married Haryaśva, a scion of the Aiksvāka race, and their son was Yadu and from this Yadu descended the Yādavas. Madhu was a Daitya and a Dānava. Pargiter; so much obsessed by the literal truth in Purānas though conscious of their absurdities and confusions, terms it as a spurious genealogy based on mass of absurd confusions. If he had applied his own standards of sifting the truth from the mass of Brāhmanical falsehoods, he could have come to a right conclusion The mention of Madhu as a Yādava and also the progenitor of Yadus is not peculiar. Pargiter himself has found several such other instances in the Purānas. Yayāti is a descendant of Purūravas and hence a Paurava and the progenitor of Pūrus. Duṣyanta is a Bharata and progenitor of Bhārata race The mention of Madhu as a Daitya and Dānava is also not unexpected. The Purānas know Bāli as an Ānava and a Dānava. The transference of genealogies, transpositions of relationships from father to son and vice versa and avoidance of distinction between different periods are the discrediting but real features of the Purāṇas.[89] In this state of affairs, we should formulate a fresh standard. The Purāṇa that directly deals with the immediate problem should be given preference over the rest. The Harivamśa Purāna has been created to deal with the Kṛsna and the Yadu traditions. The author of this Purāna was naturally an expert at this tradition and was primarily interested in giving all the known facts about the subject of his Purāna. The Harivaṁśa Purāṇa than any other should be relied on regarding the origin of the Yadu tribe. Madhu, thus, appears to be a historical

88. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit. (Kali Age); page 2-3; 54-55-56.

89. F. E. Parfiter; op. cit. (A. I. H. T.); Chapter V.

person belonging to the Daitya and the Dānava section of the Ahi race. Yadu, the founder of the Yādavas, was an Aiksvāka born of the daughter of the demon Madhu. [90]

Aikṣvāka-Ahi Yadus

The Yadus, thus, appear to be Iksvākus. It appears that the Kuvalāśva, the ancestor of Yadu, had annexed the realms of Pūru-Dānava Dhundhu son of Madhu. Yadus occupied the southern Saraswatī regions after the death of their maternal relation Dhundhu and, by and by, extended their sway to the west. The Turvaśas joined them. May be, Madhu's daughter, following the matriarchal system of her father's Ahi race, remained at the seat of her father's or brother's domain; Haryaśva I married her there, implanted Yadu in her and came back to Ayodhyā And Yadus flourished in their own matriarchal home. Yadus were matriarchal people till the Upanisadic Age. Kṛsna Devakīputra [91] reminds the ancient matriarchal system of the Yadus. If that had happened, Yadus still belonged to the Ahi race, the seed being unimportant in the matriarchal system of society Anyway, Yadus spring from the Ahi-Iksvāku blood They were an important constituent of the Pañcha-Jātāh.

As noticed in the preceding section, it appears that the whole Saraswatī region was at one time populated by the Pūrus. Dhundhu is son of Madhu and also a Paurava. It appears that Madhu might have been a descendant of Prāchīnvant or this might have been his another or transformed name. If Madhu is a Pūru, the Yadus, then, would have descended from Pūru-Ikṣvāku blood and carved out a separate republican region from the Pūru-Jana. The Yadus, alongwith the Turvaśas, occupied the southern Saraswatī region where Paurava Dhundhu was killed. Yadus also, like the Pūrus, are Aiksvāka Ahis

4. THE TURVAŚAS

The People

The Turvaśas were a people [92] They also appear as Turvaśa-

90. Robert Shaffer; Ethnography of Ancient India; 1954; page 19.
91. Chhāndogya Upaniṣad 3. 17. 6.
92. Ṛgveda 6. 3. 4. 7; 8 1. 4. 1; 1. 8. 1. 18, 1. 10. 4. 6; 6. 2. 5. 12.

Yadu.[93] They appear with Ānava.[94] The feats of Turvaśas and Yadus in common have been dealt with in the previous sub-chapter. They had formed temporary alliance with the Brahmāryans at the initial stages but they soon fell apart from them. The Turvaśas and the Yadus had attacked Divodāsa and fought battles with him.[95] They were defeated in Dāśarājña war along with other constituents of the Dāśarājña confederacy. They were drowned in the river Paruṣṇī, killed in naval battle on the waters of Paruṣṇī, alongwith Bhṛgus and Druhyus.[96]

Ikṣvāku-Ahi Turvaśas

The Turvaśas were given over by Indra to his allies the Sṛñjayas.[97] The Turvaśas remained allies of the the Sṛñjayas for a long time[98] and merged with them to form the Pāñchāla people.[99] They were considered Yavanas[100] till very late.

The Turvaśas, like the other constituents of Dāśarājna confederacy, were non-sacrificing people. They closely appear with Yadus. Purāṇic tradition makes Turvaśa, the real brother of Yadu. That gives them, like the Yadus, Ahi-Ikṣvāku lineage. It is quite certain that they were the non-Āryan Bhāratīya peoples arrayed against the Brahmāryan invaders.

The Turvaśas, under the leadership of Viśwāmitra, lost the Dāśarājña war circa 1100 B. C. Marutta is the last Turvaśa king, according to the Purānas. He adopted Duṣyanta of Pauravas and the Turvaśas then merged in the Paurava line.[101] Marutta is removed from Viśwāmitra by two degrees. The Brāhmaṇa and Purānic evidences agree together about the extinction of the Turvaśa line in the first quarter of the

93. Ṛgveda 5. 2. 17. 8; 7. 2. 2. 8, 4. 3. 9. 17; 10. 5. 2. 10.
94. Ṛgveda 8. 1. 4. 1.
95. Ṛgveda 7. 2.2. 8; 9. 3. 1. 2.
96. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1. 6.
97. Ṛgveda 6. 3. 4. 7.
98. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 13. 5. 4. 16.
99. C. V. Vaidya, op. cit.; JBBRAS Vol. 23 page 56.
100. Mahābhārata (Cr. Ed.); 1. 10. 26.
101. F. E. Pargiter, op. cit.; (A. I. H. T.); page 108.

first millennium B. C. Whether they merged in the Pauravas, themselves the Ahis, or Pāñchālas, is immaterial. They were extinct in Indian history by middle of the first millennium B. C.

5. THE ANUS

The People

The Anus are the fourth constituent of the Pañchajātāḥ. They formed a part of the republican confederacy, the Pañchajanāḥ. The Anus appear in the Ṛgveda alongwith the Pūru, the Yadu, the Turvaśa and the Druhyu; [102] along with the Druhyu, the Turvaśa and the Yadu [103] and along with the Turvaśa alone. [104]

The Anus took prominent part in the battles against Sudās. They do not appear during the time of Divodāsa The warriors of the Anus and the Druhyus, hostile to Sudās, perished to the number of 66000 in Dāśarājña war. [105] Varuna and Mitra hurled their weapons against the Rāksasāh and against the malignant Ānava, [106] an Anu leader.

Origin of Anus

The Ṛgveda associates the Ānavas with Rāksasas The Brahma and Harivaṁśa Purānas make Anus lineage descend from Kakseyu, one of the sons of Raudrāśva of the Paurava line. Raudrāśva is two degrees down to Haryāśva I of the Iksvāku line, the progenitor of the Yadus. Raudrāśva is a descendant of Sudhanvān-Dhundhu of the Paurava line. [107] This Dhundhu has previously been identified with Dānava and Daitya Dhundhu son of Madhu. The Ānavas, thus, appear to have sprung from the Paurava blood just by the time of the origin of the Yadus. Mahābhārata calls the Ānavas Mlechchhas. [108] This clearly indicates that Ānavas belonged to the Ahi race.

102. Ṛgveda 1. 16. 3. 8.
103. Ṛgveda 8. 2. 5. 5.
104. Ṛgveda 8. 1. 4. 1.
105. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1 14.
106. Ṛgveda 6. 6. 1. 9.
107. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit. (A. I. H. T.); page 108-109.
108. Mahābhārata (Cr. Ed.); 1. 80. 26.

The Ānavas till the times of Uśīnara occupied eastern border of Punjab. Śibi extended his conquests west-words and his sons founded the four kingdoms of Vṛṣadarbhas, Sauvīras, Kekayas and Madrakas or Madras. Sauvīras were in the middle Saraswatī region. Titiksu, the seventh descendant of Anu, brother of Uśīnara, founded a new kingdom in the east which was divided among Bali's five sons Aṅga, Vaṅga, Kaliṅga, Puṇḍra and Suhma. This Ānava king Bali is also called a Dānava. Pargiter sees confusion in Ānava Bali and Daitya Bali. This confusion of Pargiter is the result of his presumption that Ānavas were the Āryans and Dānavas their adversaries. He ignored the Ṛgvedic association of the Ānavas with the Rākṣasas and their descent from the Pūru line. Bali is called both Ānava and Dānava. One Dīrghatamas was the husband of a Dāsī, Uśijā by name and begot from Bali's queen the above five sons Anga and his other four brothers [109] As noticed earlier, Anga, Vanga, Kaliṅga, Puṇḍra and Suhma are pre-Āryan pre-Dravidian proto-Australoid people. This region remained detestable to the Brāhmanas uptil the earlier part of the first millennium A. D. The Āryans were able to Brāhmanise South Bihar and Bengal by the middle of the third century A. D. Aṅga, Vanga, Puṇḍra, Kaliṅga and Suhma were populated by Asuras. Bihar continued to be under the Asuras till the advent of Śiśunāga to power. [110] Śiśunāgas came to power circa 430 B. C. [111] This evidently proves that Bali if ever he existed, was a Dānava, later termed as Asura and he was called Ānava because Ānavas had descended from the Pauravas of the Ahi race.

Eastern Ānavas a Fabrication

The Ānavas do not apper in the post-Vedic Brāhmana literature. It appears that the assignment of the Eastern Bhārata to Ānavas and to Bali's five sons is a pure Brāhmanical

109. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit. (A. I. H. T.); page 158.

110. D. R. Bhandarkar, Āryan immigration into Eastern India; A. B. O. R. I. Vol. 12, pages 114, 116.

111. Radhakumud Mookerji; Rise of Magadhan Imperialism (in The Age of Imperial Unity); 1953; page 38.

fabrication. Western Ānavas disappear after Śibi and his sons even before the Purāṇic Dāśarājña War. Even the Eastern Ānavas disappear after the so called Bhārata battle circa 900 B. C. Even Videha was not Brāhmanised before 900 B. C. The whole of the Eastern India was non-Āryan by 900 B C [112] It, therefore, appears quite reasonable to assume that there was no Bali, Ānava or Dānava. It is only a case of wrongful transference of Ānava history of western Bharata to Eastern Bhārata The Ānavas populated only western Bhārata when the Brahmāryans colonised it circa 1000 B. C. The Ānavas afterwards either coalesced with the Brahmāryans or with some other tribe. The Ānavas were a minor people, perhaps descended from Pūrus, playing only subsidiary role under the Pūrus They were non-sacrificing people and were Mrdhravāchah, speaking a non-Āryan hostile speech The Anu people were the pre-Āryan Bhāratīya people of the Iksvāku-Ahí stock.

The descent of Ānavas from the Pūru blood indicates the further division of the Pūru territory in the Saraswatī region. The Anus along with the Druhyus occupied the middle Saraswatī region. The Pūrus followed the matrilineal system and might have carved out a separate region from their ancestral home. This is of great historical importance We see the great Pūru-jana developing into the great Pañchajanāḥ of the Ṛg-vedic fame. The Anus, along with the Druhyus, played a great part in Dāśarājña War.

6. THE DRUHYUS

Anus and Druhyus

The Druhyus were a republic within the Pañchajanāḥ. They occupied a territory within Pañchakṣitis. They were the people who along with the Anus had settled in the middle Saraswatī regions, i.e. southern Punjab and northern Rajasthan together with some portions of upper Sindh.

The Druhyus appear together with the Anu, the Turvaśa and

112. D. R. Bhandarkar; op. cit.; page 113.

the Yadu[113] and with the Pūru, the Yadu, the Turvaśas and the Anu. [114] They were valorous people like the Pūrus. Indra is prayed to bestow the Druhyu power so that the enemies in war may be destroyed.[115] Their principal act, recorded in the Ṛgveda, is their participation in the Dāśarājña War. [116] They fought the forces of Sudās at the Paruṣṇī and also on land. Some of them were drowned in the Paruṣṇī. They, along with the other constituents of the confederacy, lost the war.

Origin of Druhyus

The Purānas make Druhyu real brother of Pūru and Anu from Śarmiṣṭhā, daughter of Dānava Vṛṣaparvan. The Brahma and Harivamśa Purānas divide the Druhyu genealogy in two parts and assign Dharma son of Gāndhāra to Anu.[117] The Anus had lineal relationship with the Pūrus. The Druhyus, therefore, also appear to have some blood relationship with the Pūrus. The Druhyus were Mlechchhas. [118]

It does not stand to reason that the Druhyus ever populated Gāndhāra as so prominently mentioned by the Purāṇas. Divodāsa and Indra waged many battles in Arachosia, and Gedrosia. We find the Yadus, the Turvaśas and the Kṛṣnas fighting the Brahmāryan invaders there but nowhere the Druhyus. The driving of the Druhyus to the north west by the Śibis is only a Purāṇic fabrication The Druhyus never pressed beyond the middle Saraswatī region.

The Druhyus, also, like other members of the Dāśarājña confederacy, were non-sacrificing people. They were Mṛdhravāchaḥ. We do not find them playing any part after the Dāśarājña war. According to the Purānic tradition, they went out of history even before the Purāṇic Dāśarājña War. The Purāṇic tradition about the Druhyus is wholly unreliable and untrustworthy.

113. Ṛgveda 8. 2. 2. 5.
114. Ṛgveda 1. 16. 3. 8.
115. Ṛgveda 6. 4. 3. 8.
116. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1. 6, 7. 2. 1. 12, 7. 2. 1 14.
117. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit. (A. I. H. T.); page 108, 264.
118. B. C. Law; The Tribes in Ancient India; 1943; page 12.

Aikṣvāka-Ahi Lineage

It appears that a very large part of the Ikṣvāku race first separated from the main stock at some point of time in the hoary past due to certain reasons; ideological and geographical. They came to be known as Ahis and due to their power and prestige constituted the Ahi sub-race. Later on, the advent of the Mediterranean people in the early part of the third millennium B. C., made a significant change. They were assimilated in the Ahi sub-race. They appear to have advanced in the east and occupied the whole Saraswati region. They were now nearer to the main Iksvāku stock. As they had newly come in large numbers, they assumed the epithet Pūru. The contacts of these Ahis with the Iksvākus distinguished them from their elder brothers of the west, the Vrtras and others. These Ahi Pūrus due to matrimonial alliances with the Ikṣvākus, became divided in the Yadus, the Turvaśas, the Anus and the Druhyus. Chronologically, the Yadus sprang from the Pūrus first, then the Turvaśas, then the Anus and possibly after all the Druhyus. The later four peoples were the lineal branches of the main Pūru racial stock. Pūrus were Aiksvāka Ahis. The Yadus, the Turvaśas, the Anus and the Druhyus, hence, were also Aikṣavāka Ahis. They jointly constituted the great Pañchajanāh who offered strong opposition to the foreign Brahmāryan invaders in the Dāśarājña War These five peoples, ethnically, became known as Pañchajātāḥ.

CHAPTER V

THE IKṢVĀKU-AHIS OF WESTERN BHĀRATA

1. THE KUS'IKAS

Viśwāmitra

Viśwāmitra was the supreme Commander-in-chief of the Dāśarājña confederacy. He led the main attack of the united Bhāratīya opposition to the Brahmāryan forces under Sudās and Indra at Hariyūpīya situate west across the confluence of the Vipāś and the Śutudrī in the Punjab. He crossed the rivers to meet the enemy with boat-loads of the Bharatas, the collective name of the peoples constituting the Dāśarājña Confederacy, [1] along with their possessions. [2] This Viśwāmitra who led these Bhāratīya troops was the son of Kuśika. [3] This Dāśarājña War was fought on the waters of the river Parusnī, on the plains of the Punjab and northern Rajasthan and finally near the Yamunā. The Bhāratas finally were defeated and sub-jugated. [4] This great servant of the Bhāratīya people, Viśwāmitra, was Bharata-rsabha, [5] the great Leader of the Bharatas.

Conversion of Viśwāmitras

After the defeat of the Bhāratīya peoples in the Dāśarājña War; the Brahmāryans colonised the land of their conquest and settled here. They renamed the region they colonised as Brahmāvarta, covered by the Brahma people. They embarked upon the policy of large scale conversions of the local population. The utter ruination of the political power and the great destruction of the social system forced the Bhāratīyans to be coerced to make peace with their victors. They

1. R. C. Jain, Pre-Āryo-Brahma Bharatas of Bhārata; read before the 1960 Aligarh Session of Indian History Congress.
2. Ṛgveda 3. 3. 4. 11–12.
3. Ṛgveda 3. 6. 4. 5.
4. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 16. 5. 6.
5. (1) Aitareya Brāhmana; 7. 17.
   (2) Śāṅkhyāyana Śrauta Sūtra; 15. 25.

voluntarily or involuntarily coalesced with them. The house of Kuśikas could not remain united for long. It disrupted. The moety under the leadership of Madhuchhandas son of Viśwāmitra joined the Brahmāryans, Viśwāmitra himself siding with his peace-loving sons. He glorified Indra and thus protected the Bhārata people. [6]

Viśwāmitra and his fifty sons were the greatest spoil of war for Sudās and Indra. The foreign victors wanted to firmly establish and cement their hard-won victories. For that the utmost cooperation of the original people was the first and prime condition Vasiṣṭha fell from the favour of Sudās, who for political reasons, appointed Viswāmitra his High Priest. Viśwāmitra crossed over from the Śramanic way to the Yajñic way. He, on being appointed High Priest, sacrificed for Sudās. Sudās and Indra were pleased with the Kuśikas who also won from them the right of drinking Soma with them. [7] Now the race of Kuśikas began to invoke Agni. They initiated Bhārata-Agni Agni, son or father of Aṅgiras, became Bhārata Agni [8] This Bhārata-Agni became beloved of Indra, the leader, the friend of man and the chief leader amongst leaders. [9] Two Bhārata leaders Devaśravas and Devavāta, also patronised this new born Agni, generated by them with ten fingers. They churned the very powerful and wealth-bestowing Agni for vast riches. The vanquished Bhāratīyans adopted the Agni or the Yajñic way. Agni or the Yajñic way thus established itself on the frequented banks of the Dṛsadavatī, Apāyā and Saraśwatī; [10] the Brahmāvarta.

The Kuśika quislings by rendering this significant service to the Brahmāryan invaders in strengthening their hold on their colonised county, now made a permanent home, won highest favours from their new masters. They were raised to the highest status in the Brahmāryan society. They

6. Ṛgveda 3. 4. 16. 12.
7. Rgveda 3. 4. 16. 9. 10.
8. Ṛgveda 2 1. 7. 1; 2 1. 7. 5.
9. Ṛgveda 4. 3. 4. 4.
10. Ṛgveda 3. 2. 11. 2–4.

became first born of the Brahma.[11] The Kuśikas desirous of protection, became the faithful followers of Indra.[12] Kuśikas identified themselves so much with the policies and acts of Indra; that Indra himself became one with them. He himself took pride in calling himself a Kuśika, the highest favour on the Kuśikas. Ṛsi Madhuchhandas (son of Viśwāmitra) was abundantly endowed with possessions by Indra. It appears that Kuśikas saw the utility of coalescing with the foreigners for saving their people from utter extinction. The main motives were the physical necessity of the preservation of existence and economic subsistence.

The Purānas derive the genealogy of Kuśikas from Kuśa, a descendant of Jahnu. We find several accounts of Jahnu's origin in the Purānas. One account traces him from Purūravas' son Amāvasu. The other account makes him the son of Ajāmīḍha of the Paurava line who happens to be nine degrees below Bharata son of Duṣyanta.[14] Pargiter in attempting the synchronism of Trayyārṇua, Gādhi, Urva and Kṛtavīrya holds that Kuśika, father of Gādhi, married Paurukutsī, may be a daughter of Purukutsa and she was Gādhi's mother[15] and Viśwāmitra's grand mother. This Purukutsa, as noticed earlier, is an Aikṣvāka and a Rākṣasa. This makes the descent of Kuśikas from the Ikṣvāku-Ahi blood. But Jahnu was not the contemporary of Purukutsa or his son Trasadasyu, as presumed by Pargiter, and Paurukutsī could not be married to him. May be, she was married to Kuśika, the father of Viśwāmitra, and this blood relationship of Viśwāmitra, and Trasadasyu, the levirate son of Purukutsa, might have facilitated the coalscence of the Viśwāmitra's with the Brahmāryans. Such transpositions and substitutions of different persons is not uncommon in the Purāṇas.

11. Ṛgveda 3. 2. 17. 15.
12. Ṛgveda 3. 4. 4. 9.
13. Ṛgveda 1. 3. 3. 11.
14. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit.; (A. I. H. T.); page 99.
15. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit., (A. I. H. T.); page 152.

Historical Importance of Śunahśepa Legend

The legend of Śunaḥśepa throws very significant light on the problem. Viśwāmitra had a hundred and one sons, fifty older than Madhuchhandas, fifty younger. Those that were older did not think this (the adoption of Śunaḥśepa by Viśwāmitra and the acceptance of his sovereignty by his sons) right. Then he cursed them (saying) "your offspring shall inherit the ends. These are the (people), the Āndhras, Puṇdras, Śabaras Pulindas and Mutibas, who live, in large numbers beyond the borders, most of the Dasyus are the descendants of Viśwāmitra.[16] Madhuchhandas and his fifty younger brothers accepted the superiority of Śunaḥśepa who was renamed Devarāta. Shorn off legendary gloss, this narration discloses a great historical event The Viśwāmitras were in a dwindling position after their utter annihilation in Dāśarājña war. The Angirasas pursuaded them for coalscence. The Kuśika elders opposed the move and remained Dasyus. The younger Kuśikas surrendered to the Brahmāryan power and accepted one of the Āngirasas as their sovereign. Trasadasyu might also have used his influence with his Kuśika relations in this mone.

Ikṣvāku-Ahi Kuśikas

Viśwāmitra has been called Bharata-ṛsabha in the above stroy of Śunaḥśepa. Pargiter sees a historical confusion in this title of Viśwāmitra[17] because the first Viśwāmitra was long anterior to Bharata Dausyanti This epithet of a later Viśwāmitra has been wrongly transferred to the first on account of the Brāhmaṇical lack of historical sense. Pargiter's confusion is due to two reasons. First, he took too literally the Purānic evidence. Secondly, he wrongly presumes Bharatas to be the Āryans and descended from Dauṣyanti. Even according to Pargiter, the first Viśwāmitra son of Gadhi is contemporary to Satyavrata-Triśaṅku whose son Hariśchandra

16. (1) Aitareya Brāhmaṇa; 7. 18.
(2) A B. Keith; Ṛgveda Brāhmaṇas; The Aitareya and Kausītaki Brāhmaṇas of the Ṛgveda; 1920; page 307.

17. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit. (A. I. H. T.) page 64.

purchased Āngirasa Śunḥśepa for homicide in the Puruṣamedha. Thus Viśwāmitra is long posterior to Purukutsa of Purānic tradition, though he is his contemporary in the Ṛgveda and there we also find the Bharatas. No Bharata Dauṣyanti ever flourished after the Ṛgvedic Dāśarājña War. This makes Bharata Dausyanti a pure myth There remains, then, no confusion in Viśwāmitra being called a Bharata-ṛsabha. This Śunḥśepa legend unearths more historical events than has so far been believed.

We, thus, find that the Kuśikas were the Pūrus, the Dasyus, and the Iksvākus on the maternal side They have also been reckoned amongst Paulastya Rāksasas.[18] All these legends unanimously prove that the Kuśikas were the pre-Āryan, non-Āryan Bhāratīya people. They, like the Pūrus, belonged to the Iksvāku Ahi race.

2 THE PAÑCHA-DASYU-KUS'IKAS

Post-Harappan Cultures

Marshall, Wheeler, Piggot and other archaeologists have suggested the limits of the Harappan civilization between 2500 and 1500 B. C Fairservis has extended the date of the fall of the Harappa culture to 1200 B. C.[19] The Āryan speaking people were present in Asia in the fourteenth century B. C. as is evidenced by the Boghaz-Keui inscriptional evidence. Moving eastwards, they are likely to have reached the Ghagghar and the Sutlej valleys during the following couple of centuries The explorations at Hastinapur reveal the existence of Painted Grey ware in Period II dated by B. B. Lal circa 1100 to circa 800 B. C.[20] If we accept the upper limit at 1100 B. C. for the appearance of the Grey ware people and if they are identified with the Āryans, as is very much probable, then the annihilation of the Harappan civilization may be dated circa 1100 B. C.

18. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit. (A. I. H T.) page 241.

19. B. Subbarao; The Personality of India, 1958; Page 96.

20. B. B. Lal; Excavation at Hastinapur and other explorations in the upper Gaṅgā and Sutlej Basins 1950-52; Ancient India No. 10 & 11 (1954 & 1955); Page 23, 150.

The destruction of the Harappan state influenced largely the way of the Harappan people. The descendants of the Harappans, after the end of their glorious days, lived somewhere in India, still holding to their culture, if in a modified form, to contribute its traits to the pattern of Indian culture, either directly or through the Āryans or some other agency. Otherwise, the existence of Harappan elements in Indian culture will remain unexplained.[21] In the new dried up Ghagghar bed, the ancient Saraswatī, about three dozen or more Harappan sites have been located. The holy rivers, the Saraswatī and the Drsadvatī had their confluence three miles north of Rangamahal, the epi-centre of Rangamahal culture, in Ganganagar District of Rajasthan State. Numerous grey ware sites have been located in this archaeologically very important region, but no grey ware settlement is found on the Harappan settlements It seems that the people who used Grey Ware pottery as a rule avoided settling on the Harappan sites.[22] The post-Harappan culture has also been traced in this region [23]

The survival of the Harappan, post Harappan and the Āryan cultures side by side is of great significance All the streams of proto-historic cultures mingle in the pivotal point the proto-historic trijunction, the old Brahmāvarta (the Saraswatī and the Drsadvatī Valleys) and north-eastern Rajputana. Discoveries at Ukhlina in Meerut District of Uttarpradesh disclose Harappan 'fabric.' Greyware levels have been found at Kauśāmbī. So the possibility of these being either very late Harappan or being derived from the Post-Harappan cultures has to be stressed. The clear evidence for slightly later dates for the Harappan, and the close inter-links of its direct descendant, Post-Harappan cultures of Kathiawad, with the Pre—N B P proto-historic chalcolithic cultures of Central India (Madhyapradesh) suggest the possibility of Harappan survival in the peripheral regions to the east, West and south of the main Indus basin. The Harappans might have some direct contacts with the Post-Harappan cultures of the

21. A. Ghose; Ancient India No. 10 & 11; Page 3.
22. Hannath Rydh; Rangamahal, 1959, Figure 8, Page 42.
23. B. Subbarao; op. cit page 100.

sub-continent. This Ganganagar area appears to be some sort of rendezvous with various elements converging, but in fact diverging from this point. The significance of this proto-historic trijunction, the existence of the Harappan, Post Harappan and Grey Ware sites in the same area; cannot be over-emphasised.[24] The Indian archaeologists have not so far given any final verdict whether the Cemetry-H people or Ravi people or Painted Grey Ware people or Narmadā people were the Āryans or not; still they all do suggest, provisionally only on what they call circumstantial evidence, that they may be connected with the Āryans, scientifically, the Brahmāryans. I think the Greyware people claim the credit of being equated with the Āryans.[25] The seat of the proto-historic trijunction, the Brahmāvarta region, is of great historical significance Three routes trifurcated from here One went direct to the east The second went to north and then to east below the Himalayan valleys. The third went to the south via Gujerat and Malwa. The Harappans after their final destruction by the Grey Ware people diverged from here through these three routes. The remaining Harappans and the victorious Grey Ware people had conjointly evolved a mixed society in course of time in this region. They first converged here and after their historic fusion diverged from here in these three directions through these three routes on the footsteps of their vanquished enemies, the Harappans, who later, were called Post-Harappans.

If Greyware people have correctly been identified with the Brahmāryans, we may safely identify the Harappans with the Bhāratīyans. The Bhāratīyans whom the Ṛgvedic Āryans finally annihilated in the Dāśarājña War belonged to the Iksvāku-Ahi blood. The constitution of the Dāśarājña confederacy clearly indicates this fact. If the archaeologists speak of pre-Āryan Bhāratīyans as Harappans, the sociologist may call the people of the Iksvāku-Ahi blood as Harappans. The Harappans are Pre-Āryan non-Āryan Bhāratīyans of

24. B. Subbarao; op. cit; page 101, 111, Figure 31.

25. R. C. Jain; The Most Ancient Āryan Society, 1964; Chapter 2 Section IV.

the Ahi Blood. The Āryans exactly pursued the three routes traversed by the post-Harappan people after the Āryan military conquest. The archaeological evidence referred to above has been corroborated by the linguistic evidence so ably provided by Grierson. He divides Bhārata exactly into these three linguistic regions. Rhys Davids has rightly held that the course of the Āryan immigration did not alone lay along the valleys of the Gangā and the Yamunā. He postualates at least two other lines of equal importance, one down the Indus round the Gulf of Kutch and so upto Avantī, and another along the foot of the mountains from Kashmir by the way of Kośala, to the Śākya country and River Son as through Tirhut to Magadha and Anga.[26] The archaeological evidence of Harappan and Post-Harappan sites prove the validity of the eastern and the southern routes.

Emigration of Non-Cooparating Bhāratīyans

Three factors emerge from the foregoing discussion. First, the Bhāratīyans suffered military invasions of the foreigners and were finally defeated by them. Second, that the foreigners and a section of the original peoples coalesced together and evolved mixed culture in Brahmāvarta. Third, the non-cooperating Bhāratīyans left their West Bhārata home for other regions of their own kinsmen The Rgveda corroborates these conclusions The Bhāratīyans had been annihilated and subjugated in Dāśarājña War circa 1100 B C. at the hands of the Brahmāryans After their defeat, a section of the Iksvāku-Ahi peoples coalesced with the Brahmāryans such as the Kuśikas, the Pūrus and other constituents of the Bhārata people. Those who did not accept the Brahmāryan suzerainty, like a moety of the Viśwāmitra's sons who accepted Śunahśepa as their super-lord; were forced to seek fresh homes and pastures new beyond the frontiers of the colonised far-western and western Bhārata.

Pañcha-Dasyus

Dasyu-chief Viśwāmitra's fifty sons had accepted the Brahmāryan suzerainty. His fifty sons did not accept the

26 Rhys Davids; Buddhist India ; 1959; Page 16.

foreign slavery. They and their progeny remained Dasyus as before. They were forced to live beyond the borders of the Āryan settlements. These Dasyus were the Āndhras, the Puṇḍras, the Śabars, the Pulındas and the Mūtıbas. The Brahmāryans did not come in contact with these Dasyu descendants of Viśwāmitra till the composition of later Vedas circa 800 B. C. They came in their contact during the period of Aitareya Brāhmana circa 700 B. C. The Brahmāryans had first followed the eastern route. They knew the country of Bhārata to the north of the Vindhyas. Southern Bhārata remained unknown to them till Pānini's time [27] circa 450 B. C The country of the Āndhras, the Pundras, the Śabaras, the Pulindas and the Mūtibas covered central and eastern Bhārata. These Dasyus were Ikṣvāku-Ahi people

Their Territories

Āndhras were the non-Āryan tribes residing originally in Eastern India between the Krsnā and Godāwarī rivers.[28] They are the modern Telugu people. The Pundras resided in the country whose boundaries were Kāśi on the north, Anga, Vanga and Suhma on the north east and the east, and Oḍra (Ondra-Odradesa-Utkala ; modern Orissa) on the south-east, inhabited the territory which forms today Chota Nagpur less its southern portion. This region is still the habitation of the Mundas [29] The Śavaras (a numerous section of Kolarian race) are the southern most of any tribe that still speak a Kolarian language and they have maintained their distincitive title from vary ancient times These Śobars or Śavaras descended from Viśwāmitra. This large tribe of the Śavaras inhabited in Shahabad and Bihar, Ghazipur and Mirzapur and part of central India.[30] Western border of India was the home of Khonds and Śavaras. They had a very illuminating civilization and culture of their own. The Śavaral institutions of

27. R. G. Bhandarkar, Early History of the Dekkan; 1957; Page 15.
28. Macdonell and Keith; Vedic Index, 1958; Vol I Page 24.
29. Sylvain Levi; The Pre-Āryan and Pre-Dravidian in India; 1909; Paga 86.
30. W. H. P. Driver; The Sobors; Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal; Vol LX (1891) page 82.

religion, sociology and politics were of the most developed type. They still live in Orissa, Bihar, Bengal, Uttarpradesh, Vishala, Andhra and Madras. Their language so ra has special affinities with the Oriya language [31] It appears that they were widely dispersed over vast area stretching from Eastern Districts of Uttarpradesh to South Bihar and Orissa. Orissa was their speical home. The Pulindas are located in the hills of the Satpuras, the Vindhyas and the Arvalli [32] The country of the Mūtibas, as known to me, has so far not been identified. They might have just been the neighbours of the Pulindas. May be, they inhabited Bengal as it has not been included in any of the above territories. The territories covered by these Pañcha-Dasyu-Janāḥ is predominantly a proto-Australoid area. They so remained till they first met the Brahmāryans after Pānini's time; i. e. circa 300 B C. These post-Vedic Kuśikas; the descendants of the Dasyu-chief Viśwāmitra of the Iksvāku-Ahi race, were classed as Dasyus even during the historic period and even now. Many of the modern Adivāsī tribes may be traced to have descended from the Kuśikas and Kuśika Viśwāmitra.

3. THE PAÑCHA-ĀNAVAS

Five Peoples of North-West

The Pakthas, the Bhalānas, the Alinas, the Visānins and Sivas were the five peoples who glorified Indra who had earlier recovered the cattle of the Ārya from these Trtsus, who slew the enemies in battle.[33] Three facts emerge from this Rgvedic hymn First, Indra fought a battle with them and plundered their wealth. Second, they joined the Brahmāryan society and adopted the name of the biggest social group of the Brahmāryan invaders, the Tṛtsus, who played the most important part in the Dāśarājña War. Third, they accepted the foreigner's way and accepted Indra's leadership. The word Tṛtsus, in this hymn, is commented by Sāyana as 'Violent

31. Siddheswar Hota; So : Ra : Loans in Oriya; Journal of the Oriental Institute, Vol XI No 4 (162), Page 328-329.

32. Sylvain Levi; op. cit; Page 91.

33. Ṛgveda 7, 2, 1. 7.

people'.[34] This epithet could not be applied to Indra's own people. Indra nowhere fights the Tṛtsus. These Tṛtsus must have been his enemies at some time. The word then can reasonably be applied to Tṛtsu converts. The word Tṛtsu here, signifies the enemy people converted to Tṛtsu society. This sūkta gives very important details of the Dāśarājña War fought between Sudās, Indra and Tṛtsus on one side and Pañcha-Janāḥ, Ajās, Śigrus, Yaksas and others on the enemy side. The Tṛtsu, in this context, can not mean plunderer.[35] He may mean a 'former plunderer' but not a Tṛtsu of the Brahmāryan society. These five peoples belonged to contiguous geographical territories in northern Arachosia.

Pakthas

Pakthas are mentioned in three Ṛgvedic hymns. In one, they are mentioned as a protege of Aświns.[36] The second reference is in Bālakhilya section which may not be relied upon.[37] The third reference[38] is very late when even the remniscences of the Dāśarājña War were forgotten. The Ṛgveda remembers them as peoples allied to the Brahmāryan people. Zimmer holds that they were a northern tribe. They may be identified with modern Pakthoons of Eastern Afghanistan. Turvāyaṇa was a king or leader of the Paktha people.[39] These Pakthas were the enemies of the Tṛtsus at first; as Divodāsa's fight with Turvāyana, king of Pakthas, goes to show. Sudās in view of impending danger, formed a new alliance with them.[40]

Bhalānas-Alinas-Viṣānins

The Bhalānas were closely allied to Pakthas, Their original home, as suggested by Zimmer, on the comparision of the

---

34. Ṛgveda Saṁhitā (V. SM.), op. cit; Vol II Page 306.
35. H. H. Wilson; Ṛgveda; 1927; Vol IV Page 144.
36. Ṛgveda 8. 4. 2 10.
37. Ṛgveda 8. 49. 10.
38 Ṛgveda 10. 5. 1. 1.
39. Macdonell & Keith; Vedic Index; Vol I Page 464.
40. A. C. Das; Ṛgvedic culture; 1925; page 361.

name with Bolan Pass, in east Kabulistan [41] appears to be correct. Roth considers them as allies of Tṛtsus.[42] Viṣāṇins were a tribe of the north west. Alinas were also their neighbours in the north-west of Kafirstan.[43]

Śivās

The fifth allied tribe to the Pakthas and others were the Śivās. They have rightly been identified with the Śibis or Śivis. Śivapur or Sibipur is situate in Shorkot region of Chang in Punjab. The Śibis were a republic. They extended their habitat as far south as Nāgarī, Mādhyamikā and Chittor in southern Rajasthan.[44] The earliest reference of a Śivi King, Amitratāpana is found in the Aitareya Brāhmana [45] Anukramanī mentions a Rsi Śibi Auśīnara.[46] Uśīnara in not mentioned in the Ṛgveda but an Usinara lady is mentioned [47] The Uśīnaras are mentioned with the Kuru-Pañchāls and the Vaśas. [48] The Vaśas and the Uśīnaras were a united people [49] The Vaśas were connected with the Matsyas. [50] Uśīnara descended from the Ānavas.[51] The Rgvedic Śivas, thus, are Ānavas of the Iksvāku-Ahi racial stock. Their associations with the Matsyas, the Pakthas, the Bhalānas and others testifies to their pre-Āryan non-Āryan blood. After the defeat of the Bhāratīyans, they, like other constiiutents of the Bharatas, coalesced with the foreigners. Their later association with the Kuru-Pañchālas may be traced to their earliest conversions in the North-West-Frontier regions.

41. Macdonell & Keith; op. cit, Vol II Page 99
42. Macdonell & Keith; op. cit; Vol I Page 39,
43. Macdonell & Keith, op. cit, Vol II Page 313 Vol I Page 39.
44. B. C. Law; op cit (A. T. A. I), Page 82-83.
45. Aitareya Brāhmana, 8. 23.
46. Ṛgveda 10. 12. 28.
47. Ṛgveda 10. 4. 17. 10.
48. (1) Aitareya Brāhmana; 8. 14.
    (2) Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, 4. 1.
49. Gopatha Brāhmana 1. 2 9.
50. Kauṣītakī Upanisad, 4. 1.
51. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit (A. I. H. T.); Page 88.

Pañcha-Ānavas

The Purānic tradition says that Śivi Auśīnara originated the Śivis in Śivapur and extending his conquest westwards founded through his four sons the kingdoms of Vṛṣadarbhas, Madras (or Madrakas), Kekayas (or Kaikeyas) and Suvīras (or Sauvīras). The Druhyus ruled in the Punjab at that time. Śivi and his sons must have driven them back into that corner which became known as Gandhāra.[52] The extension of the Śivi republic upto the borders of Afghanistan is very important. The Śivas and the other four peoples must have been on the frontiers of Western Bhārata when the Brahmāryan forces had entered the region of Arachosia. It might be quite possible that Śivi people and their associates the Pakthas, the Bhalānas, the Visānins and the Alinas were related in blood. They prominently appear together in the Rgveda. The idea might have been caught upon by the Purānic rhapsodists of late and these people might have been transferred with transformed names and territories. We find Anus in the Ṛgveda along with the Śivis, definitely the Ānavas. Without pressing the Purānic genealogy too much, it may be gathered that the five sons of Uśīnara pressed their way to the Arachosian regions and their descendants later came to occupy certain other regions of Punjab and Sindhu. It seems quite reasonable to assume that the Śivas, Pakthas, Alinas, Bhalanas and Viṣānins belonged to the Ikṣvāku-Ahi people. They were, as later known, of the Ānava ethnic stock.

4. SOME OTHER ĀNAVAS

Ambaṣthas

Apart from the several Anu tribes, we notice in the post-Rgvedic age, some other Anu tribes which played some historical role. The Ambaṣṭhas, a leading branch of the Ānavas, lived in the eastern borders of the Punjab.[53] They are mentioned with Śivis and Kṣudrakas.[54] One Ambaṣṭha prince

52 F. E. Pargiter; op. cit.) A. I. H. T.) ; Page 264.

53. (1) F. E. Pargiter ; op. cit (A. I. H. T); Page 109.
(2) B. C. Law; op. cit (T. A. I.), Page 96.

54. Mahābhārata (Cr. Ed); 2. 5. 2. 14-15.

is mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmana who performed an Aśwamedha. He is mentioned with Indra Tura Kāvaṣeya and Janamejaya Pārikṣita.[55] This Ambaṣṭha prince appears to have performed this Aśwamedha in the nineth century B. C. The non-Āryan Ambaṣṭhas of east Punjab finally merged in the Brahmāryan society in the ninth century B. C.

Kekayas

The Kekayas descended from the non-Āryan Anus. Their territory at one time extended from Vipāś (Bias) to Gandhāra. They had matrimonial alliances with the Ikṣvākus.[56] During the Vedic times, the Kekayas resided between the Sindhu and the Vitastā.[57] Aśvapati Kaikeya was a great Kekaya king during the Upaniṣadic age who imported the knowledge of Ātman to five Brāhmana priests [58]

Śṛñjayas

The Śṛñjaya people had come in contacts with the Brahmāryans during the age of Divodāsa. Sṛñjaya was son of Devavāta. [59] Devavāta was Bhārata. [60] It appears quite reasonable to assume that the Śṛñjayas were non-Āryan pre-Āryan Bhāratīya people. The tradition that they descended from the Ānavas is [61] here corroborated by the Ṛgvedic evidence; hence this Purāṇic tradition is trustworthy. Śṛñjaya is the ancestor of Uśīnara and Śivi and a north-West Ānava. Prastoka was the son of Śṛñjaya. [62] When we meet the Śṛñjayas in the Rgveda, we find them allies of the Brahmāryans.

---

55. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa; 8. 2. 1.
56. B. C. Law; op. cit (T. A. I), Page 77-78.
57. F. E. Pargiter; Journal of Royal Asiātic Society; 1908; Pag 317-332.
58. (1) Śatapatha Brāhmana; 10 6. 12. 2.
    (2) Chhandogya Upaniṣad; 5. 11. 4.
59. Ṛgveda 4. 2. 5. 4.
60. Ṛgveda 3. 2. 11. 2.
61. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit (A. I. H. T.); Page 145.
62. (1) Ṛgveda 6. 4. 4, 25.
    (2) Śankhyāyana Śrauta Sūtra; 16. 11. 11.

We do not know whether they were subjugated after battles or they made peace without any combat. The Śrñjayas appear closely associated with Divodāsa; hence it appears that they made peace with the foreign invaders in the initial stages. The Śṛñjayas were held in high respect by Indra. He defeated the Turvaśas and gave them up to Śṛñjayas. He subjected the Vṛchīvants to them.[63] Prastoka, son of Śṛnjaya, has been lauded with Divodāsa for his munificenses. Prastoka gave ten purses of gold and ten horses in Dāna (gifts), along with Divodāsa, who donated the treasure won from Śambaras as spoil of war.[64] We thus, find the Trtsus and the Śrñjayas closely allied at the initial stages of the Brahmāryan military invasions. The Śrñjayas were the non-Āryan Ānavas who forged the alliance with the foreign invaders earliest.

Madrakas

The Madrakas, along with the Sindhu-Sauviras, were born in a sinful country. They were Mlechchhas.[65] The Purāṇic tradition makes them Ānavas Madra, the progenitor of the Madrakas, was a son of Śivi Auśīnara. The first reference to Madras appears in the Aitareya Brāhmana. The country of Uttaramadra is mentioned along with the country of Uttarakurus.[66] It appears that this Uttaramadra country was beyond the borders of the Himalayas. The Purānic Madra is located between Paruṣṇī and Vitastā (Ravi and Jhelum respectively).[67] A Kāmboja Aupamanyava, pupil of Madragāra, is mentioned in the Vamśa Brāhmana. This points to a possible relationship of the Madras or more probably the Uttaramadras with the Kambojas, who probably had Irānian as well as Indian affinities.[68] The Madras had become experts in the art of Yajña. The Madras, an unimportant people in the Vedic age, gain importance in

63. Ṛgveda 6. 3. 4. 7.

64. Ṛgveda 6. 4. 4 22.

65. H. C, Ray, Madra; Journal of the Asiātic Society of Benga (N. S.); Vol XVIII (1922) Page 260.

66. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, 8.14.

67. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit (A. I. H. T); Map facing Page 368.

68. Macdonell & Keith ; Vedic Index ; Vol. I, Page 138.

the Brāhmana and the Upanisadic age. Uddālaka Āruṇi and Bhujyu Lāhyāyani had received instructions in sacrificial lore from one Patañchala Kāpya of the Madras.[69] It appears that the Madrakas made alliance with the Irānāryans even in pre-Divodāsa times when they were struggling for supremacy in northern Iran. The Ambaṣṭhas, the Kekayas, the Śrñjayas and the Madrakas were Ānavas of the Iksvāku-Ahi race.

5. SOME FAR-WESTERN AHIS.

Irānian Ahis

The earliest battles of the Āryans when they descended over Iran through Pamir range from their northern home were fought on the borders of northern Iran. The military combats had taken place long before the times of Divodāsa and Sudās. The Irānāryan adversaries in that age have been referred to as Ahis in the Rgveda They have also been referred to as the Raksas, the Panis, the Dānavas and the Dasyus These peoples existed in ancient Iran ; the far-western province of Bhārata and Western Bhārata. The scholars unanimously agree that they were the pre-Āryan non-Āryan peoples of ancient Iran and Bhārata. They have generally been referred to as Ahis.

Kambojas

We have earlier seen that the Uttaramadras lived beyond the borders of the Himalayas. Kamboja was a country in the vicinity of the Uttaramadras. The Kambojan people had evolved the republican political system. Kamboja was a Janapada and so continued till Mahavīra's time. It is classed as republic amongst the Sixteen Mahājanapadas.[70] These celebrated peoples had their Janapada in the upper, Oxus region. Its capital Dvārkā has been identified with Darwaz in Pamir-Badakshan region.[71] Yāska considered the Kambojas as non-Āryans. He maintains that word Śavati meaning to go is used by the Kambojas only . ..Its modified form Śava is used

69. Brhadāraṇyeka Upaniṣad, 3. 3 1; 3. 7. 1.

70. T. W. Rhys Davids, The Early History of the Buddhists (in Cambridge History of India), 1955, Page 153.

71. S. B. Choudhari; Ethnic settlements in Ancient India; 1955; Page 138.

by the Āryans.[72] This north eastern tribe of the Kambojas had always been mentioned in connection with the Yavanas, Śakas and the like. The Kambojas, hence, were non-Āryans.[73] The Kambojas along with Pahlavas, Nāgas, Niṣādas, Dāsas, Dasyus, Raksas, Pāradas and Pulindas had always been outside the Āryan fold.[74] Their association with Nāgas is not without historical significance.

Pānini beonlged to the north-west quarter of India and hence had an accurate knowledge of the customs and dress of the Kambojas. Pānini speaks of the Kambojas as Muṇḍa or shaven headed. The Kambojas were in the habit of completely shaving their heads.[75] We also find Muṇḍa people in eastern India along with Mallas, Magadhas and Videhas[76] The Muṇḍa custom of completely shaving the head is an Austric custom. The Kambojas, thus, appear to have belonged to the proto-Australoid racial stock.

Gāndhāras

The Gāndhāra people are mentioned only once in the Rgveda. The actual word used is not Gāndhāra but Gāndhārin. Rājā Bhāvya, Bhavāyayya of Śāṅkhyāyana Śrauta Sūtra,[77] is the husband of Lomaśā, daughter of Bṛhaspati. She, when her desires are assented to, clings as tenaciously as female weasel and who is ripe for enjoyment; yields Bhāvya infinite delight. Lomaśā replied and prayed her husband to approach her and not to deem her immature as "I am covered with down like a ewe of the Gāndhārins." This Bhāvya dwelt on the banks of the Sindhu.[78] Bhāvya was a patronymic of Svanaya who was the patron of Kakṣivant. Ludwig thinks that Svanaya was

72. Yāska; Nirukta, 2. 2.
73. G. P. Grierson; The Language of the Kambojas; Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society; 1911 Pages 801–802.
74. A. D. Pusalkar; op. cit (V. A.); Page 313.
75. B. C. Law; op. cit (T. A. I.); Page 3.
76. Sylvain Levi; op. cit; Page 87.
77. Śāṅkhyāyana Śrauta Sūtra; 16. 11. 5.
78. Ṛgveda 1. 18. 6. 1.

connected with the Nahuṣas.[79] The Sindhus were Mlechchhas. Nahusas were Ahis. Kakṣivant, son of Dīrghatamas, was a Dāsa. Daughter of Bṛhaspati was married to a non-Āryan leader of Sindhu region.

Zimmer thinks that the Gāndhāra people were settled in the Vedic times on the south bank of the Kubhā upto its mouth in the Indus and for some distance down the east side of the Indus itself.[80] Purānic tradition maintains that Gandhāra, from the line of descent from Druhyu, gave his name to the Gāndhāra region. The Ānavas, also according to the Purānic tradition, had pushed west the Druhyus upto Gāndhāra and established their suzerainty there. The Druhyus are given two lineages. The majority of the Purānas trace the Druhyus from Druhyu himself. The Brahma and Harivaṁśa Purānas divide it into two; assigning to Druhyu the successors down to Gāndhāra; and Dharma and the remainder to Anu.[81] It appears quite probable that when the Anus pushed west and established the regions of the Śivas, the Pakthas, the Bhalānas, the Alinas and Visānins, they also extended their sway over the Gāndhāra proper. The Druhyus merged in the Anu's and the Anu's lineage was given to these mixed people also The descendants of Anus or Druhyus; the Gāndhāra people belonged to the pre-Āryan non-Āryan Ahi sub-race.

Though Gāndhāra was forced into submisson in the early period ; it appears to have gained its freedom soon after. Gāndhāra, like Mūjavants, Angas and Magadhas, was a disfavoured region for the Brahmāryans They cursed Gāndhāra to be visited by Takman fever.[82] Gāndhāras were a Dardic people[83] The Daradas were linked with Gāndhāra and Śivapur. They lived in the north-west frontier of Kāśmīra. Darad means mountain,[84] hence, Dardic peoples and also the

---

79 Macdonell & Keith; Vedic Index; Vol. II Page 103.

80. Macdonell & Keith; Vedic Index, Vol. I Page 219

81. F. E. Pargiter, op. cit (A. I. H. T.); Page 108.

82. Atharvaveda; 5. 22, 14.

83. R. Shaffer; op. cit (E. A. I.); Page 29.

84. B. C. Law; op. cit (T. A. I), Page 86.

Gāndhāra people were mountaineous people. One Nagnajit, king of Gāndhāra, is reported to have been a contemporary of Nimi, king of Videha, Durmukha, king of Pāñchāla, Bhīma, king of Vidarbha and "Karkaṇḍu" king of Kalinga. His views did not conform to traditional Brāhmanism.[85] Uttarādhayayana Sūtra states that Nagnajit, also the other kings; belonged to the Jaina faith; after having placed their sons on the throne, they exerted themselves as Śramaṇas.[86] Durmukha, king of Pāñchāla, may be referred to the period of sixteen Mahājanapadas which may be placed probably early in the sixth century B. C.[87] Nagnajit, hence, may be placed in the sixth century B. C. He appears to have adopted the faith of Pārśva Jina. The name of the person may here also be suggestive of his blood. Looking to the nature of the territory, it would not be a hazardous presumption if we give Nagnajit Ahi nationality. Gāndhāras, as just referred, belonged to the Ahi race. Ahi race appears to have a very close association with the Jaina faith since the dawn of history. Nagnajit was Nāga Mahāvīra was Nāga-putra. The Gāndhāras were the Nāgas. It appears that some Gāndhāras had adopted the Brahmāryan faith as the above Devastuti of Bhāvya suggests. But the stigma against the Gāndhāras still continued with full vehemence. This event suggests that the Gāndhāras, to a very large measure, had retained their freedom and their way. They did not give unto the Brahmāryan pushes and presses. The Gāndhāras remained Ahi people till at least the middle of the first millennium B. C

Pārāvatas

The Pārāvatas were a people settled on the northern border of Gedrosia. They were originally mountaineers. Ludwig holds a similar view and Geldner recognises a people in

---

85. H. C. Rey Chowdhari; Political History of Ancient India; 1950; Pages 146-147.

86. H. Jacobi; Jain Sūtras (Scared Books of the East Series), 1895; Vol. 45 page 07.

87. H. C. Roychowdhari; op. cit; Page 95, 135,

them.[88] The Saraswatī has been referred to as Pārāvataghnī.[89] This shows that the mountaneous people living about the origin of the Saraswatī in the Himalayas upto its entrance in the plains near the Yamunā were also called Pārāvatas. One Pārāvata was an enemy of Indra. Indra plundered his wealth and distributed it amongst the kinsmen of the Ṛṣi,[90] a worshipper and follower of Indra. The Pārāvatas have been included in the list of the victims, who were presumably all Brahmāryan adversaries, at the Aśwamedha.[91] The Pārāvatas were known as people residing on the banks of the Yamunā in the Brāhmana period.[92] The Pārāvatas appear to have lingered in history till the Anukramni period. One Pārāvata Kanva has been made the Rsi of the Rgvedic Sūktas 8. 2. 7 ; 9 7 1 and 9. 7 2. The Kanvas were the dark non-Āryan people as shown later. The association of the Pārāvatas with the mountains of Gedrosia and with those to the east of Kāśmīra clearly shows that they belonged to the Ahi racial stock.

Bālhīkas

The Bālhīka, along with Gāndhāra, Kāpiśa and Kamboja, was a famous country of the trans-Indus region of India Kāpiśa related to Kafiristan, between the Kunar river and Hindukush mountain which separated it from Bālhīka. The epic Bālhīkas have been located somewhere near the Kuru-land but the Vedic Bālhīkas are to be located fear away in the north.[93] This location of the Bālhīkas further north beyond the Hindukush would place them somewhere near the Uttaramadras. In the epic and later literature, a country and its people, Bālhīkas or Bālhīkas are also mentioned. They have been located around Sialkot region in Punjab[94] They were different people from

88. Macdonell & Keith. Vedic Index; Vol I page 519.
89. Ṛgveda 6. 6. 12. 2.
90. Ṛgveda 8. 10. 7, 6,
91. Śukla Yajurveda; 24-25.
92. Pañchaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa; 9. 4. 10.
93. S. B. Choudhari; op. cit; Pages 108-133.
94. S. B. Choudhari; op. cit; Page 117.

the northern most Bālhikas, living in the Punjab and the Indus regions in Brāhmanic times. [95]

The Balhikas have not been referred to in the Ṛgveda. The Atharvaveda mentions them along with the Mūjavats and the Mahāvrsas. They are cursed with the visitations of fever Takman.[96] The Bālhikas and the Vāhikas were outside the pale of Āryandom. [97] Their association with the Mūjavants and the Mahāvṛsas connects them with the Ahi racial stock.

Mūjavants

The Mūjavants were a people residing in the country of the same name to whom the fever Takman may visit along with the Balhikas and the Mahāvṛsas. [98] Soma is called Mūjavant as having born on the mountain Mūjavant. [99] Mūjavant is equivalent to Muñjavant, [100] a mountain in the Himalayas. Rudra is asked to go beyond the Mūjavatas rejoicing with his portion of offerings. [101] Śukla Yajurveda gives Mūjavatas for Mūjavats, meaning, thereby, apparently a hill tribe in the north-west. [102] Mūjavant appears to be a mountain in the north-west Himalayas near Kambojas and Bālhikas The Mūjavant people did not find favour with the Āryans of Irān and Bhārata They appear to have belonged to the mountainous Ahi racial stock

Mahāvṛṣas

The Mahāvṛṣa people are also cursed with the Mūjavants and Balhikas to be visited by fever Takman. The Mahāvṛṣas were a neighbouring tribe, looked down upon as gatherers of

95. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa; 1. 7. 3. 8.
96. Atharvaveda; 5. 22, 5, 7, 9.
97. B. C. Law; op. cit (T, A. I); Page 71.
98. Atharvaveda; 5. 22. 5, 7, 8, 14.
99. Ṛgveda 10. 3. 5 1.
100. Yāska; Nirukta; 9. 8.
101. Taittitrīya Saṁhitā; 1. 8. 6 2.
102. (1) Śukla Yajurveda; 3. 61.
(2) Ralph. T. H. Griffith; The Texts of the White Yajurveda; 1957, Page 29.

dung for fuel, on account of the lack of wood in their country.[103] This shows that the Mahāvṛṣa country was in mountainous regions. The women of the Mūjavants, the Mahāvṛsas and the Bālhikas are called Dāsī and Śūdrā. The Takman fever is sought to be relegated to these regions not to seek the Dāsī and the Śūdrā.[104] This shows that the peoples of Bālhika, Mūjavant and Mahāvṛsa were under the matriarchal social system. They belonged to the racial stock of the Dāsīs and the Dāsas. They belonged to the Ahi race

6. SOME WESTERN AHIS

Hariyūpiya

It has earlier been noticed that the military troops of the Dāśarājña confederacy, collectively called Bharatas, under the leadership of Viśvāmitra, crossed the joint stream of the Vipāś and the Śutudrī. The junction of the Vipāś and the Śutudrī, in earlier times, was a bit lower than at the present site. The famous archaeological site of Harappa is very near to it in the west. The Bharatas lived in eastern Punjab, specially round the banks of the Sarasvatī and the Dṛṣadvatī, and had marched to west to meet the Brahmāryan foreign invasion. This word Harappa had contained in itself the old remniscences of the important city of Hariyūpīya mentioned in the Ṛgveda.[105]

Vṛchivants

The city of Hariyūpīya was situate on the eastern part of the river Yavyāvatī. Sāyana considers Hariyūpīya and Yavyāvatī as identical.[106] He gives Hariyūpīya as a city or a river. Sāyana appears to be confused here. It appears that Hariyūpīya was a city on the river Yavyāvatī. Yavyāvatī has also been mentioned as a river in the Pañchviṁśa Brāhmana.[107] Hillebrandt identifies Yavyāvatī with one in Iran,

103. W. D. Whitney; Atharvaveda Saṁhitā; 1962; Page 259.
104. Atharvaveda 5. 22. 6-7.
105. Ṛgveda 6. 3. 4. 5.
106. Ṛgveda Saṁhitā (V. S. M.); Vol. III. page 106.
107. Pañcha-Viṁśa Brāhmaṇa; 25. 7. 2.

the Djob (Zhobe), near the Iryāb (Haliab) but there is no reason to accept this identification. [108]

Yavyāvatī is Paruṣṇī

The internal evidence from the Ṛgveda provides us with a clue which may help us in identifying the river Yavyāvatī. The reading of the two Ṛgvedic Sūktas 6. 3. 4 and 7. 2. 1 provide us the clue. The Ṛgvedic Sūkta 7. 2. 1. narrates the actual events of the Dāśarājña battle at Paruṣṇī and elsewhere. Chayamāna was a descendant of Pṛthvī. Abhyavartin was son of Chayamāna. Indra favourd Abhayavartin. He destroyed the race of Varaśikha, killing the descendants of Vṛchīvants. Indra subjected the Vṛchīvants of Abhyavartin and gave up Turvaśa to Sṛñjaya, the ally of Indra in this battle. [109] This event happened on the river Yavyāvatī. In the battle hymn given in the Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1. we find that Kavi, son of Chayamāna, was killed by the opposing Bhāratīya forces. The evil-disposed and stupid (enemies of Sūdas) crossing the humble Paruṣṇī river had broken down its banks and killed Kavi. Turvaśas preceded the army; i.e. the Turvaśas had been in front line of the combating army; but they, like the Matsyas, Bhṛgus and Druhyus were quickly assailed [110] and perhaps taken as prisoners of war. The joint reading of these passages in the two sūktas lead us to believe that when the Dāśarājña battle began between the Brahmāryan forces under Sudās and Indra and the Bhāratīyan forces under Viśvāmitra; the Chayamānas and the Turvaśas were on the front lines and faced each other. Kavi Chayamāna was killed. Turvaśas were annihilated and captured. Hariyūpīya was given to Abhyavartin Chayamāna in compensation of his real brother's sacrifice in war and the captive Turvaśas were handed over to another ally, the Sṛñjayas. This battle was fought on the banks and on the waters of the famous river Paruṣṇī. This is a very reliable piece of the Ṛgvedic evidence that helps us in identifying the Yavyāvatī with

108 Macdonell and Keith; Vedic Index; Vol. II. page 188.

109. Ṛgveda 6. 3. 4. 5, 7, 8.

110. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1. 6, 8.

the Paruṣṇī. Yāska maintains that Irāvatī is called Paruṣṇī, i.e. having joints, (shining) winding.[111] Pischel suggests that the name is derived from the "flocks" (Paruṣ) of wool, not from the bends of the river, as understood by the Nirukta, or from its reeds, as Roth suggests.[112] But the view of Pischel also appears to be wrong. The Paruṣṇī was a great river. It had irrigated vast lands and grown good crops. The Harappans were mainly an agricultural people and not the pastoral people like the Āryans. It may be true that they might have flocks of sheep also but that was only a secondary profession with them. The name, if at all it has certain geographical suggestion, must be related to some agricultural product The name Yavyāvatī itself suggests the crop mainly grown in the region watered by the Parusnī; i.e, the yava or barley The Yavyāvatī was so called because it helped the people to grow good cereal crops of barley. The earlier name of Paruṣnī was Yavayāvatī as its later name had become Irāvatī It appears that the Rāvī was known as Yavyāvatī before the Brahmāryan invasions, Paruṣnī after the Brahmāryan victory and Irāvatī in later times which became Rāvī in modern times Yavyāvatī, Paruṣṇī, Irāvatī and Rāvī is the chronological sequence. The Yavyāvatī was the Parusnī in the Ṛgvedic age. Hariyūpīya was the capital of the Vrchīvants, constituent of the Dāśarājña confederacy.

Vaikarṇas

Vaikarna people appear only once in the Ṛgveda in the narrative details of the events that happened in the Dāśarājña War. Sudās overthrew twentyone Jana of the two Vaikarṇa republican leaders.[113] Śāyana comments the word Vaikarna as a Janapada.[114] It appears that twentyone small local republics; a part of the two Pañchaksitis; or their leaders had been killed by Indra in the Dāśarājña war. Druhyus had

111. (1) Lakshman Sarup; op. cit. (N & N); page 147.
(2) Yāska, Nirukta; 9. 26.

112. Macdonell and Keith; Vedic Index Vol. I page 499.

113. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1. 11.

114. Ṛgveda Saṁhitā (V. S. M.); Vol. III. page 308.

been drowned in the waters. The cities of the Anus and the Druhyus had been demolished. [115] This clearly connects the twentyone Jana with the Anus and the Druhyus. The Anus and the Druhyus were two great republics; the two of the Pañchakṣitis. The two Vaikarṇas may, here, be identified with the two Anu and Druhyu Janapadas. Zimmer's conjecture that they were a joint people, the Kuru-Krivis, [116] appears imporbable. The Kuru tribe did not exist during the Dāśarājña period. The Kuru tribe was evolved as hybrid mixture of the victors and their vanquished people who coalesced together. The Krivis never were a constituent of the Dāśarājña confederacy. They resided in the Sindhu and the Askini regions where no battle of the Dāśarājña war was fought. The Kuru-Krivis were never associated with the Dāśarājña war hence they can not be identified with the Vaikarṇas. The only possible interpretation of the Vaikarṇas, in the present context, makes them the republican Anu and Druhyu people.

Krivis

The Krivi people were settled on the Sindhu and the Aksinī. [117] The word Krivi has been used in the Ṛgveda for about a dozen times. It has mostly been used in the sense of a well but the sense of people is also quite clear. Indra struck Krivi with thunderbolt and consigned him to eternal slumber on the earth. [118] Indra has overcome Krivi in conflict by his prowess. The Krivis appear to be a minor people who had some uneventful skirmishes with the foreign invaders. They were soon subjugated. They joined the foreign invaders in the regions, of the Sindhu and the Aksinī and prospered there under Maruts patronage who bestowed happiness upon them. [119] The Krivis appear to be non-Āryan adversaries of the Sindhu region, later dubbed as a Mlechchha country.

---

115. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1. 12. 13.
116. Macdonell and Keith; Vedic Index; Vol. II page 327.
117. Macdonell and Keith; Vedic Index; Vol. I page 198.
118. Ṛgveda 2. 2. 6. 6.
119. Ṛgveda 8. 3. 8. 24-25.

Dirghatamas, Leader of Krivis

Sāyana associates Gotama with Krivi where he translates the word as "well." Dīrghatamas who later became Gotama, was the son of Uchathya and Mamatā. He married Dāsī Uśijā and had Kakṣīvant as son.[121] Dīrghatamas is famous as Māmateya and Kāksīvant as Auśija Dīrghatamas, the blackest and the darkest, and his son, thus, appear to have been associated with the matriarchal social system of the Dāsī people. The matriarchal social system to which Dīrghtamas belonged was a pre-Āryan non-Āryan social institution.[122]

When the Krivis were defeated, their leador Dīrghatamas entered in treaty of peace with the victors under Maruts who provided or preserved him for the Krivis.[123] Some of the Dāsas, the kinsmen of Dīrghatamas, did not relish the idea and hurled Dīrghatamas down in maternal waters. He was saved to become the Brahma of those who seek to obtain the object of their works.[124] The maternal waters, according to Sāyana, may mean the well-waters associated with Dīrghatamas, the Gotama. It appears that Dīrghatamas was thrown into a well by the Dāsas He was not thrown into any river. The assumption of a river appears to be absurd. This event took place in the Sindhu region. The river associated with Dīrghatamas in the Purānas took him to Anga country. No river goes from the Sindhu to Anga. The Purāṇic rhapsodists could as well have thrown him into the well following Sāyana. The association of Krivis with Dīrghatamas is well established.

One legend about Gautama given in the Ṣaḍviṁś-Brāhmaṇa throws much light on the Gotama's race problem. The Devas and the Asuras contended with each other. Between them Gotama practised austerities. Indra went upto him and spoke

120. Ṛgveda Saṁhitā (V. S. M.), Vol. III page 648.

121. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit (A. I. H. T); page 158, 161.

122. D. D Kauśāmbī; Origin of Brāhmaṇa Gotras; I. B. B. R. A. S. (N. S.) Vol. 26 pages 41–42.

123. Ṛgveda 8. 3. 8. 24.

124. Ṛgveda 1. 22. 2. 2. 5–6.

"Do you act as spy for us here ?" "I can not do so," he answered. "Then let me go in your shape" said Indra. Indra went in the shape of Gotama.[125] Indra in the shape of Gotama deceived them. Asuras considered Gotama their own kinsman. The association of Dīrghatamas, the Gotama, with matriarchal system, with the Dāsas, the Dāsīs and the Asuras and with dark, black skin clearly makes him a scion belonging to the Ahi racial group. Dīrghatamas was a Krivi leader. The Krivis, therefore, were the non-Āryan Bhāratiya people belonging to the Ahi race residing in the Sindhu and Aksinī regions.

Matsyas

The Matsyas were a people of note.[126] They took part in the Dāśarājña war. They along with the Bhṛgus and the Druhyus,[127] with the Turvaśas in their front, offered opposition to the troops of Sudās and Indra but they were routed. They were connected with the Vaśas and the Śalvas.[128] The Matsyas do not find place amongst the Purānic tribes. The conjecture of Pargiter that they were probably Yādavas[129] does not find any corroboration and sound proof. The Matsyas were associated with the non-Āryan Śalvas. They were also associated with Uśīnaras.[130] The Vaśa might have been an Ānava tribe. The Matsyas are not related to any of the Pañchajātāḥ. It appears reasonable to assume that, like Ajās, Śigrus and others, they belonged to the Ahi race. The Matsyas, the non-sacrificing people, later coalesced with their victors. In the Brāhmanic period, we find Dhvasan Dvaitavana perfor-

---

125. W. B. Bellee; Ṣaḍviṁśa Brāhmaṇas; 1. 1. 24; page 19.

126. (1) Gopatha Brāhmaṇa 1. 2. 9.

(2) Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 13. 5. 4. 9.

(3) Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad 4. 1.

(4) A. C. Das; Ṛgvedic culture; 1925; pages 162–163.

127. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1. 6.

128. Gopatha Brāhmaṇa 1. 2. 9.

129. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit (A. I. H. T) page 118.

130. Gopatha Brāhmaṇa 1. 2. 9.

ming sacrifice.[131] The Matsya territory comprised of Alwar, Bharatpur and Jaipur. The Matsyas, after coalescence, are alleged to have become, along with the Kurus, the Pāñchālas, and the Śursenas, a constituent people of the Brahmarṣi-deśa.[132] They were not a constituent of the Brahmāvarta country which comprised of the holy land between the Sarasvatī and the Dṛṣadvatī· It shows that the Matsyas coalesced with the Brahmāryans long after their defeat in the Dāśarājña war, probably in the seventh century, B. C.

Śalvas

The Śalvas are not mentioned in the Ṛgveda. They were closely associated with the Matsya people The Śalvas inhabited the vicinity of the Kuru and the Trigarta at the western foot of Aravali.[133] Their territory was situate near Mt. Abu. The Śalvas were a people of note and were called as Dānavas and Daityas.[134] The Śalvas, thus, appear to have belonged to the Ahi race.

Simyus

The Simyu people were defeated by Sudās in the Dāśarājña battle at the Parusnī.[135] Indra attacked the Dasyus and Simyus, slew them with his thundurbolt. The association of Simyus with the Dasyus clearly indicates that they were pre-Āryan Bhāratīyans belonging to the Ahi race.

Ajās : Śigrus Yakṣus

The associated peoples; the Ajās, the Śigrus and the Yaksus, under the leadership of Bheda, met the forces of Sudās and Indra in the Dāśarājña war near or on the Yamunā and they were defeated.[136] This battle marked the final phase of the Dāśarājña war and the combined military opposition of the Bhāratīya confederating peoples, under the leadership

131. Śatapatha Brāhmana 13. 5. 4. 9.

132. Manusmṛti; 2 19, 7. 193.

133. S. Levi; op. cit; page 80.

134. F. E Pargiter; op, cit; (A. I. H. T) page 290.

135. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1. 5.

136. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1. 19.

of Viśvāmitra, was finally annihilated here. This final battle was fought near Ahisthala, the capital of the Ahi people, and the military conquest of Bhārata by the foreign invaders was complete here. Śigrus and Yakṣus were the non-Āryans.[137] The Ajās, the Śigrus and the Yakṣus were the non sacrificing people belonging to the Ahi race.

Kaṇvas

The Kaṇvas appear in the Rgveda associated with Atri and Kakṣīvat.[138] They also appear along with Dadhyañch, Angiras, Priyamedha and Manu.[139] Kaṇva had gone blind. Nāsatyas rendered effective aid to Kaṇva when blinded.[140] This evidence of Kanva's blindness and Nāsatyas help to him in the time of distress comes from Kakṣīvat Gautamī of the Ahi race who is the Ṛṣi of this Sūkta. The Kanva-Nāsatya contacts took place during the age of Kasu Chaidya whose donation has been eulogised in this hymn. Kanva was, in the beginning, an embryo-eating and life-obstructing evil being. The association of Kanva with Kaksīvat, Atri and Chedi suggests him to be ofpre-Āryan non-Āryan origin. Manu was the father of Brāhmaṇical institution of ritualised sacrifices after the Dāśarājña war. Kasu Chaidya is also a post-Dāśarājña war figure as earlier noticed. Hence the first association of the Kaṇvas appear to be in the eleventh century B C.

Dark Pre-Āryans

The Purāṇic tradition maintains that the Kaṇvas sprang from Ajamīḍha and the first mentioned Kanva is called a Kaśyapa.[142] Ajamīḍha was a Paurava and Kaśyapa was the progenitor of Ahi. Kanva belonged to the non-Āryan Ikṣvāku—Ahi race. Kaṇva, the progenitor of Kaṇvas, was a dark pre-

137. Hopkins; Notes on Dyaus, Viṣṇu. Varuṇa and Rudra; I A.O S. Vol. 16 page CLIV.

138. Ṛgveda 5. 3. 9. 5.

139. Ṛgveda 1. 20. 6. 9.

140. Ṛgveda 8. 1. 5. 23; 1. 17. 3. 7.

141. Atharvaveda; 2. 25. 1, 3, 5.

142. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit. (A. I. H. T.); page 227.

Āryan.[143] Those Kanvas who adopted the Brahma way were hailed and those who did not were demonized. The Vedic literature affords evidence of both the kinds of treatments meted to the converted and the unconverted Kanvas.

Their Habitation

The Kanva's association with Kasu Chaidya suggests that their habitation might be around the Sarasvatī-Dṛṣadvatī region. It should have been some desert region as suggested by the Rgveda. Kaṇvas are spoken to have attracted Indra by their praises. Indra, like the Gaura hastening to the pool filled with water in the desert; goes quickly and drinks freely with the Kanvas.[144] The Rsi of this Sūkta is Devatithi of the family of Kanva Two words Gauraḥ and Irinam are very important in this Rc. Sāyana comments upon Irina as a desert (Nistrinam Tatākadeśam) which is correct He comments upon the word Gaura as deer (Gaura mrgah)[145] which is worng. White deer are seldom found in deserts. The word Gaura is a Rajasthani coloquial word which means the "grazing herd of cows." The Raj asthanis residing south of Suratgarh town in Gang anagar District of Rajasthan State still today use the word Gaura for "a grazing field of fodder" or for "the herd of cows going to a grazing field." It appears reasonable to assume that the Kanvas inhabited the desert-region to the south of the Sarasvatī Dṛṣadvatī joint stream which still is and had been a desertregion since the Rgvedic age.

Yajña becomes a Peaceful Weapon

The Kanvas became great exponents of ritualised sacrificial system of Manu in the begining of the eleventh century B C. They helped Indra who, through their aid, became accomplisher of sacrifice The Kanvas declared all weapons

143 D. D. Kośambi; Origin of the Brāhmaṇa Gotras; I.B.B.R.A.S. Vol. 26 (1950) page 44.

144 Ṛgveda 8 1. 4. 2. 3.

145. Ṛgveda Saṁhita (V. S. M.); Vol. III page 548.

needless.[146] This Ṛc reflects a great historical event. The black skinned Kanva converts had brought with them their spiritual experiences of the land. They helped Indra to evolve a policy of peace and win. The military might was no longer necessary and it always reacts in a violent opposition. The hearts and minds instead the bodies of the vanquished had to be won for making the victory permanently secure. The Kaṇvas prevailed upon Indrat o see the futility of military arms in the then context in Bhārata. The Yajñic way could become an effective weapon to win the hearts and minds of the defeated adversaries. Retualised Yajña now took the place of weapons of violence in cementing the political victory won by the Brahmāryans.

The Kaṇvas, on the admission of their own progenitor, were a timid people and wealth desiring.[147] The Aświns present fairskinned women to black Kanva. On the fulfilment of this event, Kanva regains his sight. The regaining of sight, shorn off the gloss, simply means that he regained the Brahmāryan sight and being unable to see (through distress and turmoil), abondoned his old Bhāratīyan sight. The event narrates the social conversion of the Kaṇvas to the Brahmāryan Yajñic way. The Kaṇvas were black skinned and Kaṇva was Kṛṣṇa ṛṣi.[148] They, the Kaṇvas thenceforward, became great protige of Indra. They glorified him[149] and through him obtained the friendship of all the minor Devas. They offered Soma profusely to Indra and the other Devas.[150] The Kaṇvas not only became subjects of Indra, they also began to magnify Indra's wisdom, manhood and strength.[151] The element of falsehood surreptitiously is introduced. Indra and the minor Devas, in return, extended

---

146. Ṛgveda 8. 2. 13.

147. Ṛgveda 1. 8. 4. 7; 1. 9. 6. 4; 8. 2. 2. 18.

148. Ṛgveda 1. 17. 2. 8; 8. 9. 5. 3-4.

149. Ṛgveda 8. 2. 1. 3 4; 8. 1. 2. 38.

150. Ṛgveda 1 9. 4. 10; 8. 1. 2. 22; 8. 2. 3. 4; 8. 2. 1. 8; 8. 2. 1. 43.

151. Ṛgveda 8. 2. 1. 31; 8. 2. 3. 8.

their protections to Kanva for accepting the Agni or Yajña way of life. [152] They were also bestowed upon great material prosperity. [153] The dark Kanvas of the Ahi race rendered great services to their new masters.

Bharadvājas

The Bharadvājas are a people of note in later times, though they are very insignificant in the Rgvedic times. Bharadvāja is mentioned only once in the Ṛgveda though the whole sixth Maṇḍala of the Ṛgveda is generally ascribed to Bharadvāja or his descendants. The word Bharadvāja is used only as a simile. The Uśas is prayed to dawn upon the worshipper with riches as she did on Bharadvāja. [154] Bharadvāja appears to have been bestowed upon the riches Uśas possessed. Bharadvāja of the Ṛgveda is not associated either with Dīrghatamas or Bṛhaspati or Bharata.

Bharadvāja, according to the Purānic tradition, is the son of Mamatā, wife of Uchathya, mother of Dīrghatamas, not from Uchathya, but from Bṛhaspati, who consorted with her, possibly against her will, when she was heavy with Dīrghatamas and she had to carry and develop two embryos implanted on her by Uchathya and Brhaspati and gave birth to both possibly at about the same time. This Brhaspati and Bharadvāja are made to have belonged to Vaiśāli where Marutta of the Ikṣvāku dynasty ruled. This Marutta was adopted to the Turvaśas. Marutta adopted Paurava Duṣyanta. This Dusyanta had a son named Bharata who adopted Bharadvāja. [155] The racial stock of the Pūrus and the Turvaśas has been earlier established. This Bharadvāja is also referred as a purohita of Divodāsa of Kāśī. [156] The Ṛgveda knows no Divodāsa, either of Kāśī or of Pañchāla but knows only Tṛtsu Divodāsa, the supreme commander under Indra, of the

152. Ṛgveda 1. 8. 1. 10–11; 1. 8. 4 9; 1. 9. 4. 5; 1. 16. 7. 5.; 8 2. 2. 18; 8. 2 3. 20; 1. 9. 2. 5; 1. 4. 3. 2. 8. 1. 19.
153. Ṛgveda 1. 8. 1. 17, 1. 8. 1. 8; 8. 5. 3. 3.
154. Ṛgveda 6. 6. 4. 6.
155. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit (A. I. H. T.); pages 158–159; 163–164.
156. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit (A. I. H. T.); page 164.

invading Brahmāryan forces. The Ṛgveda does not mention Bharadvāja either with Divodāsa or with his grandson Sudās. Bharadvāja is associated with the age of ritualised Yajñas which developed in the post-Dāśarājña times. He is not mentioned as a Ṛṣi but only as a minor worshipper. The association of Bharadvāja with Dīrghatamas or Pūrus or Vaiśalis leads us to believe that he belonged to the dark pre-Āryan Iksvāku Ahi blood.

Atris

The Atris claim an important position in the Ṛgveda. As many as fortytwo Atri Ṛṣis are Mantra-seers. The Atris do not belong to the four original Brāhmaṇa Gotras. The Atri racial group descended from one Prabhākara who married ten daughters of Bhadrāśva or Raudrāśva, a Paurava king.[157] They stood in close relationship with Priyamedhas.[158] The Priyamedhas belonged to the Paurava line.[159] They were associated with Kanvas,[160] Gotamas[161] and Kakṣīvants.[162] The Atris (Ṛṣi Śyāvāśva of the Śūkta is an Ātreya) were spread over from the Paruṣṇī to the Yamunā.[163] The Atris are not associated with any major or minor historical event. They were minor people in the Ṛgvedic times. Their association with the Ikṣvākus, Pūrus or Ahis leads us to presume that they belonged to the non-Āryan pre-Āryan Bhāratīya racial stock. They appear in the Ṛgveda during the post-Dāśarājña period. They are priests and worshippers of Agni. The Atris, along with the large mass of the Bharatas, joined their new masters and adopted their way.

---

157. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit (A. I. H. T); page 228.
158. (1) Ṛgveda 1. 9. 2. 3; 1. 20. 6. 9; 8. 1. 5. 25.
(2) Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 8. 22.
159. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit (A. I. H. T); page 245.
160. Ṛgveda 1. 17. 3. 7; 5. 3. 9. 4.
161. Ṛgveda 1. 24. 4. 5; 5. 4. 8. 12.
162. Ṛgveda 10. 11. 15. 1.
163. Ṛgveda 5. 4. 8. 9; 5. 4. 8. 17.

CHAPTER VI

THE PRĀCHYA IKṢVĀKUS

1. THE PĀÑCHĀLAS

Prāchya Bhārata

When the Brahmāryans conquered the western Bhārata and settled in the Brahmāvarta region; the policy they adopted was to win over their vanquished adversaries to their way of life so that the victory won may be consolidated. For three hundred years or so, they did not take to military expeditions in the east. King Janamejaya, of the hybrid Kuru tribe, ruled from Taxila to Āsandivat or Ahisthala circa 850 B. C [1] The whole of the Prāchya Bhārata was populated by the proto-Australoid Iksvākus by this time

The dwellers to the east of Ahisthala were known to the Brahmāryans as Prāchyas. The word Prāchya does not occur in the Vedic literature. It first occurs in the Aitareya Brāhmana, composed in the seventh century B. C., mentioned in the list of the peoples. [2] The nearest noted Prāchya people to the Kuru region apart from the minor Chedi and Vaśa peoples, were the Pāñchālas. There were no Udīchya Pāñchālas. The Prāchya Pāñchālas [3] would therefore, refer only to the Pāñchālas of the East; belonging to the eastern region. Oldenberg includes only Kāśīs, Kosalas, Videhas and perhaps Magadhas as Prāchyas. [4] Till the Śatapatha Brāhmana times circa sixth century B C,[5] all the Prāchyas were considered by the Brahmāryans as Asuras i.e., non-Āryans. The word Asura had now become transferred from

1. H. C Roychowdhari; Political History of Ancient India, 1950; pages 36, 39.
2. Aitareya Brāhmana 8. 14.
3. A. Weber; The History of Indian Literature; 1961; page 34, Note 25.
4. A. A. Macdonell and A. B. Keith; Vedic Index; 1958; Vol. II page 46.
5. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 13. 8. 1. 5; 13. 8. 2. 1.

the Brahmāryan people to their adversaries, the Bhāratīyan people. In these Prāchya Asura regions, Agni was very difficult to be built up;[6] i.e. it was very difficult to establish the Yajñic way of life. The peoples of Aṅga, Vaṅga, Kaliṅga, Puṇḍra, Suhma and Prāgjyotiṣa were all Asura regions as noticed earlier. The word Prāchya, thus, refers to the whole of eastern Bhārata from Pañchāla to Prāgjyotiṣa. All the people from Pañchāla to Prāgjyotiśa were Asuras.

The Prāchyas may be divided into Madhyadeśa Prāchyas and the Purāna Prāchyas. The Madhyadeśa Prāchyas included Pañchāla, Kāśi, Kośala, Videha and Magadha regions. This region comprises Oldenberg's Prāchya minus Pañchāla. The Pañchāla is the first important Prāchya territory.

Federation of five Peoples

The word Pañchāla denotes a federation of five peoples. The chemical fusion of these five peoples made them one nation, but the separate identity of each of the five peoples afterwards went out of history. History knows them no more after this period. The Śatapatha Brāhmana maintains that Krivi was the older name of the Pāñchālas.[7] But it also includes the Turvaśas among the Pāñchālas.[8] This shows that Krivi were not the only people who constituted the Pāñchālas; they might have been a predominating constituent of them. They probably constituted of five peoples—the Krivis, the Turvaśas, the Kesins, the Śṛñjayas and the Somakas.[9]

Pañchālas are Ikṣvāku-Ahis

We have earlier noticed that the Krivis belonged to the Ahi racial stock. The Turvaśas were of the Ikṣvāku-Ahi race. The Śṛñjayas were a branch of the Ānavas who belonged to the Ikṣvāku-Ahi race. The Purānas make the Pāñchālas a younger branch of the Pūrus. The Kesins and the Somakas might have been some unimportant sections of the Pūrus. The

6. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 9. 5. 1. 64.
7. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 13. 5. 4. 7.
8. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 13. 5. 4. 16.
9. H. C. Roychowdhari; op. cit; page 71.

constitution of the Pāñchāla people make them a people pre-Āryan and non-Āryan. Perhaps it was for this reason, that the neighbouring Kurus forged an alliance with them. The Pāñchālas were peacefully converted. They were not conquered by military might. The Pāñchālas entered in close alliance with the Kurus and pursued common objectives. They both became famous in history as Kuru-Pāñchālas. Kuru-Pāñchāla alliance was effected in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa period in the seventh century. B. C. It knows kings of Kuru-Pāñchālas [10] Pañchāla king Durmukha made extensive conquests in every direction. [11] Jaina tradition knows one Brahmadatta, king of the Pāñchālas and one Dvimukha, also a king of the Pāñchālas. [12] This Dvimukha may be identified with Durmukha Double mouthed (Dvimukha) is always a bad-mouthed (Durmukha) Pravāhana Jaivali was the most famous Pañchāla king in the Upnisadic period. The earliest Upanisadic period may be placed in the middle of the sixth century B C. Pravāhana Jaivali engaged in philosophical discussions with the Yajñic scholars Śvetaketu went to the Parisad of the Pāñchālas [13] over which Pravāhana Jaivali was presiding Parisad was the executive organ of the pre-Āryan Bhāratīya Jana-republics [14] Śvetaketu is also spoken of as going to the Samiti of the Pāñchālas [15] He imparts the Yajñic scholar Śvetaketu the Doctrine of Transmigration of Soul. [16] This Jaivali, a Pāñchāla, belongs to Kaśyapa Gotra. [17] The Pravāhaneyas are still found in the list of

10. Aitareya Brāhmana; 8. 14.
11. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 8. 23.
12. Hermann Jacobi; Jain Sūtras (S B. E. Series); Vol 45 pages 60, 61, 87.
13. Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 6, 2, 1.
14. R. C. Jain, The Most Ancient Āryan Society; 1964; Page 30.
15. Chhāndogya Upanisad 5. 3. 1.
16. M Winternitz; A History of Indian Literature; 1959; Vol. I Part I page 201.
17. D. D. Kośāmbī: Origin of Brāhmaṇa Gotras; I. B. B. R. A. S. Vol. 23 (1947); page 26.

Bhārdvājas. Bhardvāja was the son of Mamatā, mother of Dirghatamas; not from his father Uchathya but from his brother Bṛhaspati who consorted with her and his son was Bhardwāja.[18] Dirghatamas as noticed earlier, belonged to the Krivi section of the Ahi race. Dirghatamas was a great spiritual leader who gave spiritual contents to the Brāhmaṇical institutions. There is nothing strange in it that his descendant Pravāhaṇa Jaivali imparted the knowledge of the transmigration of soul to the Yājñic scholars. Pravāhaṇa Jaivali was a great Krivi who belonged to the pre-Āryan non-Āryan Bhāratīya Ahi sub-race. The Pāñchālas, thus, appear to have been constituted of the Ikṣvāku and Ahi elements wherein Ikṣvāku appear to have been in the majority while the more important intellectual role was played by the Ahis.

2 THE MADHYADES'A IKSVĀKUS

Region of Pure Ikṣvākus

When we proceed further east of the Pāñchāla region, we meet the region of pure Ikṣvākus. Kośala had been the seat of the Iksvākus since remotest antiquity. Ayodhyā had always been acclaimed as the most ancient city. The Brāhmaṇical, the Jaina and the Buddhist sources all hold Ayodhyā as a holy city. It had rivalled Harappa and Mohenjodaro in the third and second millenniums B. C. Jaina tradition establishes the origin of the Iksvāku race at Ayodhyā in Kośala even before Manu Vaivasvata. The Brāhmaṇical tradition maintains that Kośala had been an Ikṣvāku region after Manu Vaivasvata. The epic Kośala comprised the territories of modern Oudh which lay to the east of the Kurus and the Pāñchālas and to the west of the Videhas from whom it was separated by the river Sadānīrā, probably the Gandak.[19] Kośala was divided in two parts in Vedic and the pre-Vedic times; the northern and the southern. While the northern Kośala is the country of Oudh

18. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit. (A. I. H. T.); page 158.

19. B. C. Law; Historical Geography of Ancient India, 1954; page 99.

to the north of the Ganges, the southern Kośala extends on one side upto Berar and Orissa and on the other upto Amarkantak and Bastar. The region of Chattisgarh along the upper course of Mahānadī is its nucleus. [20]

Kośalas

The earliest reference of an Ikṣvāku prince is given in Tenth Maṇḍala of the Ṛgveda,[21] and also in the Atharvaveda.[22] The earliest Iksvāku leaders are Purukutsa and his levirate son Trasadasyu. Tryaruna was also an Aikṣvāka. [23] The most important Iksvāku personages, known to the Bhāratīya tradition, are Daśaratha and Rāma. They find mention in the Brāhmanical, Jaina and Buddhist literature. The word Daśaratha finds mention in the Ṛgveda [24] but it is not a proper name here. Sāyaṇa translates Daśaratha as ten chariots [25] Rāma is mentioned as Asura in the Tenth Maṇḍala of the Ṛgveda. [26] Buddhist Daśaratha Jātaka makes Daśaratha, a ruler of Vārānasī or Kāśī; who was father of Rāma and Sītā. [27] It appears that Kāśī was a part of Kośala in the age of Rāma. The Kośalas were connected with Kāśī and Videhas. [28] Śuddhodana and Siddhārtha were Ikṣvākus. [29] Buddha has been referred as Kośalan [30] The Ikṣvākus ruled over the land of Kośala. Branches of the family are represented as ruling at Kuśinārā, at Mithilā and at Viśalā or Vaiśālī. [31] Kośala Videhas are also said to be the offsprings

20. S Levi; op. cit page 64.
21. Ṛgveda 10 4. 18 6.
22. Atharvaveda 14. 3. 9. 9
23. Pañchaviṁśa Brāhmana 13. 3. 12
24. Ṛgveda 1 18. 6 4.
25. Ṛgveda Samhitā (V. S. M.) Vol I, page 799.
26. Ṛgveda 10. 8 3 14
27. B. A. Kauśalyāyana, Daśratha Jātaka (461); Jātaka; 1951; page 325.
28. Śāṅkhyāyana Śrauta Sūtra; 16. 29. 5.
29. H. C. Roychowdhari; op. cit; page 102.
30. Majjhima Nikāya, 2. 124.
31. H. C. Raychowdhari, op. cit; page 100.

of Videgha Māthava.[32] This very important Brāhmanic statement negatives the Purānic theory of Ikṣvākus' decent from Manu. This legend of Manu's descent had not been fabricated till the sixth century B. C. This simple statement of the Śatapatha Brāhmana establishes the historical event that Videgha Māthava was the first Brahmāryan leader who first Brāhmanised Kośala and Videha.[33] The Brāhmaṇisation of Kośala, a bit earlier, and of Videha, a bit later, took place in the seventh century B. C.

Kāśis

Kāśī was bounded by the rivers Varuṇā and 'Asi respectively on the north and the south which gave rise to the name of its capital city Vārānasī. Kāśī was an important Mahājanapada in the sixth century B C. It was conquered by Kośala some time before Buddha.[34]

Kāśī is the birth place of Pārśva, the twenty third Jaina Tīrthamkara. He was son of Vāmādevī, queen of the mighty Ikṣvāku king Aśvasena of Vārānasī.[35] He flourished circa 877 B. C.-777 B. C.[36] Vedic literature does not know Kāśī before the period of the Śatapatha Brāhmana. The Kāśīs are not mentioned with favour even in this period. The Kāśīs were raided by the Yajñic people. The Kāśī people did not kindle sacred fire in this age.[37] We have no evidence to believe that they kindled the sacred fire before. The Ikṣvākus of Kāśī were not subjected to the sacred fire till Śatapatha times. Even in the Upaniṣadic age; the kings of Kāśī did not take up to sacred fire Ajātaśatru, king of Kāśī; imparts the

---

32. (1) Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa; 1. 4. 1. 10.
(2) J. Eggeling, The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, 1963, pages XLII & 104.

33. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa; 1. 4. 1. 10.

34. B C. Law; North India in sixth century B. C. The age of Imperial Unity; 1953 page 4.

35 M. Bloomfield; The Life and stories of the Jain Saviour Pārśvanātha; 1919; page 108.

36 H C Roychowdhari; op. cit; page 97.

37. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 13. 5. 4. 19.

knowledge of Ātman to Dṛpta-bālāki of the Gārgya clan; [38] but he is in no way still associated with the Yajñic fire. It appears that independant Kāśī was never brāhmaṇised. Independant Kāśī rather opposed the brāhmaṇisation of Kośala and Videha. Janaka of Videha had accepted the Yajñic fire. Ajātaśatru of Kāśī really disapproved of the persons going to Janaka of Videha [39] whom he did not consider a fit man to impart spiritual knowledge. Ajātaśatru considered that he rightly knew Brahman as self which Janaka perhaps did not know. Janaka, for his personal ends, had established monarchy in Videha in place of republic which event was disliked by the other republican powers of the region. They conferred together and the Vajjian confederacy overthrew the Videhan monarchy. The Kāśī people had a share in the overthrow of the Videhan monarchy. The Lichchhavis who succeeded Janaka's dynasty as the strongest political power in north Bihar and formed the most important element of the Vajjian confederacy, were the offsprings of a queen of Kāśī. These Lichchhavis had later, in Mahāvīra's time, formed a league with nine Mallakis and eighteen Gana-rājās of Kāśī-Kośala [40] to collectively guard their republics against the rising monster of monarchy in Magadha The mention of eighteen Gaṇa-rājās of Kāśī Kośala reveals that Kāśī during these times, had become a part of Kośala It also appears that after the fall of Videhan monarchy, Kośalan monarchy also diluted itself and restored partially the republican character of the sate. Though the king was retained; the republican leadership (Gaṇa-rājāship) was restored. King Chetak; the central figure of the confederation of Vajjis, Mallas and Kāśī-Kośala, actually assembled this confederation including the Gana-rājās of Kāśī and Kośala, to ask whether they should surrender to Ajātaśatru or fight

38. (1) Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad; 2. 1. 1.
(2) Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, 4. 1.
39. (A) Bṛhadāraṇyeka Upaniṣad. 2. 1. 1.
40. H. C. Roychowdhari; op. cit; page 83-84. 126

him. [41] Kāśī remained non-brāhmaṇised till it was absorbed in the Magadhan rule.

Videhans

The Videhans belonged to Ikṣvāku dynasty according to both the Jaina and the Brāhmaṇic traditions. The Videhans are called Prāchyas (Asuras) in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa : The legend of the Māthava's brāhmaṇisation of Kośala and Videha [42] is also narrated in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. The Great King Janaka flourished in Videha in the seventh century B. C. [43] These historical events collectively prove, that Brāhmanic yajñic civilization did not reach Videha before seventh century B. C. It was only during the age of Janaka that sacred fire could establish itself in Videha. Janaka has been termed as a Saṁrāt. This shows that monarchy was established. It appears that Videha, along with Kāśī, Vaiśālī and other neighbouring regions had republican system which was displaced by monarchy of Janaka, at the instance and with the support of the Brahmāryans which event was disliked by the rest of the neighbouring republics who finally joined together to overthrow the Janaka's new-born monarchy in the region. The Brāhmaṇical yajñic civilization reached Kośala and Videha in the seventh century B. C. and not earlier.

Magadhans

The Brāhmanical tradition concedes that the Dānava dynasty of Jarāsandha ruled over Magadha till the times of Ripuñjaya. Then, according to some scholars, the Pradyotas succeeded them and they were themselves succeeded by the dynasty to which Bimbisāra or Śrenika belonged. Some scholars hold that Jarāsandha's line was directly succeeded by ancestor of Bimbisāra. Bimbisāra according to Purāṇas belonged to Śiśunāga dynasty established by a chieftain of Kāśī named

41. Radhakumud Mukerjee; Rise of Magadhan Imperialism (in A. I. U); pages 23-24.
42. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa; 1. 4. 1. 10 etseq.
43. H. C. Roychowdhari; op. cit. page 52.

Śiśunāga.[44] The latest view is that Bimbisāra belonged to Mahā-Nāga dynasty and Śisunāga dynasty succeeded this Mahā-nāga dynasty.[45] Jaina tradition, as noted earlier, makes the Mallas, the Magadhas and the Aṅgas belonging to the Ikṣvāku race. These Ikṣvāku people have been termed by the Brahmāryans as Prāchyas, Asuras and Dānavas. We have also noted earlier that the vanquished people of the great Ahi sub-race had migrated to the east via Gujerat and Madhya-pradesh to the Aṅga and other adjoining regions. The establishment of Nāga rule in Magadha in the seventh century B. C. might commemorate that historical event The Nāgas appear to have wielded power in the east since this period. Magadha remained under the Ikṣvāku rule till the times of Bimbisāra who afterwards established Nāga power in Magadha. This Nāga power was succeeded by the Śūdra power of the Nandas. Nandas were succeeded by the Mauryas; Chandragupta Maurya being the founder of this dynasty The Mauryas originated from the Moriya clan. The Moriyas sent a messenger to the Mallas claiming a portion of the relics of the Buddha.[46] The Śākyas and the Mallas both belonged to the Ikṣvāku race. The Moriyas, thus, appear to have been a clan of the Ikṣvāku race. The Śuṅgas under Puṣyamitra, the Brāhmana, finally displaced the Ikṣvāku power in Magadha in the second century B. C.[47] Magadha (South Bihar) was not Brāhmanised till the middle of the third century A. D.[48]

The Vedic evidence does not view Magadha with favour. The Ṛgveda makes reference to the Kīkaṭas[49] who do not mix milk with Soma. They do not need any vessel for libations. The Kīkaṭas were a non-Āryan non-sacrificing people. Yāska declares that Kīkaṭa is the name of a country where non-Āryans

44. B. C. Law; The Magadhas in Ancient India; 1946; page 6.

45. Radhakumud Mukerjee; op. cit (R. M. I.) page 19.

46. Mahāparinibbānasutta;

47. B. C. Law; op. cit (M. A. I.); page 18.

48. D. R. Bhandarkar; Āryan Immigration into Eastern India A. B. O. R. I. Vol 12 page 113.

49. Ṛgveda 3. 4. 15. 14.

dwell.[50] Yāska flourished in the seventh century B. C. Kīkaṭa has been identified with Magadha.[51] The Śukla Yajurveda decries Māgadha as of excessive noise and classes him with a harlot, a gambler and a eunuch.[52] The Atharvaveda associates Māgadha with Vrātya.[53] Manu decries him as a Vrātya.[54] Purānas associate Māgadhas with the Dānavas. Magadha throughout the long course of Brāhmanical history has always been disliked. Magadha had been an Ikṣvāku region throughout with an interception of the Ahi race for three centuries circa 620–324 B. C; the Bimbisāra-Nanda period.

It, thus, becomes quite clear that Madhyadeśa comprising Kośala, Kāśī, Videha and Magadha continued to be under the Iksvāku power, sometimes independantly, sometimes under the Magadhan power; more or less till third century A. D. The brāhmanisation of Kośala and Videha in the seventh century B. C. was only a temporary phenomenon. The Brāhmanical yajñic way could not firmly establish itself even in these regions. It actually waned in the following centuries. The eastern frontiers reamined safe till the advent of the Christian era.

3. THE PAÑCHA-PRĀCHYAS

Pañcha-Prāchyas

The Madhyadeśa Ikṣvākus were closely related with the territories of Aṅga, Vaṅga, Kaliṅga, Puṇḍra and Suhma which may be collectively termed as Pañcha-Prāchyas. These regions overlap the regions occupied by the Pañcha-Dasyu-Kuśikas who immigrated from Udichya to Prāchya. Purānic tradition makes Dānava Ānava Bālī the progenitor of peoples of Aṅga, Vaṅga, Kaliṅga, Puṇḍra and Suhma. Purānic tradition places Bāli before the Purāṇic Dāśarājña war but the Vedic literature neither testifies nor suggests such a fact.

---

50 Yāska; Nirukta; 6. 32.

51. H. C. Roychowdhari; op. cit; page 112.

52. Śukla Yajurveda; 30. 5. 30. 22.

53. Atharvaveda 15. 2. 1–4.

54. Manusmṛti; 10. 11.

The post-Dāśarājña history has more or less been well-constructed. We do not find any Bāleyas in the first millennium B. C. occupying the above region. Bāli and Bāleya-Ksetra are pure myths.

Their five Territories

Aṅga corresponds to the District of Bhagalpur and Vanga to the districts of Birbhum, Murshidabad, Burdwan and Nadiya in Bengal. Kaliṅga comprised all the Eastern coast between the Utkals, on the north and the Telingas on the south. The Vaitaranī flowed through it. the Mahendra mountains (The Eastern Ghats) were within its southern limits Kalinga comprised, therefore, the modern province of Orissa, the district of Ganjam and probably also that of Vizagapatam [55] The ancient Puṇḍra; as already noticed in the previous sub-chapter; comprised the region of Chhota Nagpur and whose boundaries were Kāśī on the north, Aṅga, Vanga and Suhma on the north-east and east and Oḍra on the south east. [56] Puṇḍras inhabited the territory of Chhota Nagpur less its southern portion. In the epic, their country corresponds with Bengal and Bihar. [57] Pargiter also places the Purāṇic Puṇḍra south of Aṅga and north of Suhma and Vanga. [58] This transference of name of one geographical region to another is glaring instance of Brāhmanical freedom of wishful transferences. Suhma is situate to the east of Utkala, west of Vaṅga, south of Aṅga and north of Kaliṅga.[59] The territory occupied by the ethnic group of Pañcha-Dasyu-Kuśikas overlapped the above geographical region and extended far more to the west and the south. The Śabaras, a part of Puṇḍras and Mūtibas occupied the territories of Pañcha-Prāchyas. This region was never a Bāleya Kṣetra.

55. F E. Pargiter; Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa P. 334 quoted from Sylvain Levi; op. cit; page 74.

56. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit; page 329; quoted by Sylvain Levi, op. cit.; page 86.

57. Macdonell & Keith; Vedic Index; Vol. I page 536.

58. F E. Pargiter; op. cit (A. I. H. T.); Map facing page 368.

59. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit (A. I. H. T.); above map.

These geographical names have been exploited by the Purāṇic bardic lords for fabricating an edifying religious tale. [60] This region was occupied by the Brahmāryan adversaries; the Ṛgvedic term for whom is the Dasyu, the Brāhmaṇic the Prāchya, and the Purānic the Asura. They were finally brāhmaṇised only about the middle of the third century A. D. [61]

Pañcha Prāchyas were Ikṣvākus

Angas and Vaṅgas were non-Āryans. [62] Aṅga and Vaṅga had long remained suspect to the Āryans of India. Baudhāyana [63] prescribes in the fourth century B. C. a sacrifice of expiation after a travel amongst the Āraṭṭa, the Kāraskara, the Puṇḍra, the Sauvīra, the Vaṅga, the Kaliṅga and the Prānūna. This chain of hatred was started during the Atharvanic times. These people were unknown to the Brahmāryans before Atharvanic times. Aṅgas along with Gāndhāras, Mūjavants and Magadhas are cursed to be visited by Takman desease. [64] Aṅga-Magadhaḥ [65] and Vaṅga-Magadhaḥ [66] are also mentioned. Vaṅga-Matsyaḥ are also referred together. [67] These people were despised because they were Brahmāryan adversaries. Baudhāyana maliciously calls them half breeds. [68]

Aṅga and Magadha were the territories of the Vṛji-Lichchhavis and Mallas. Champā was the capital of Aṅga and was conquered in Mahāvīra's time by Śreṇika Bimbisāra. [69] Champā was the most flourishing city of the region. The

60. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit (A. I. H. T.); page 71.
61. D. R. Bhandarkar; Āryan Immigration into Eastern India; A. B. O. R. I. Vol 12 page 113.
62. C. V. Vaidya; op. cit (Solar & Lunar races); I. B. B. R. A. S. Vol 23 page 56.
63. Baudhāyana Dharma Sūtra; 1. 2. 14.
64. Atharvaveda; 5. 22. 14.
65. Gopatha Brāhmaṇa; 2. 9.
66. Aitareya Āraṇyeka; 2. 1. 1.
67. Atharvaveda Pariśiṣṭa; 1. 7. 7.
68. Baudhāyana Dharma Sūtra; 1. 1. 29.
69. B. C. Law; Mahāvīra; 1937; page 7, 33.

Dīgha Nikāya refers to it as one of the six principal cities of India.[70] The Kaliṅga as a tribe had always been associated with the Aṅgas and the Baṅgas.[71] Kaliṅga was ruled by a Jaina King Khārvela circa 170 B C.[72] Kalinga was unknown to the Brahmāryans till Mahāvīra's age. The Puṇḍras were linked with the Angas and the Vangas.[73] It appears very probable that the Angas, the Vaṅgas, the Kaliṅgas, the Puṇḍras and the Suhmas belonged to one ethnic group. The Mallas and Lichchhavis belonged to the Ikṣvāku race.[74] The Pañcha-Prāchyas were, therefore, of the Iksvāku race. When the Pañcha-Dasyu-Kuśikas migrated from western Bhārata to southern and eastern Bhārata; they, the Ikṣvāku-Ahis; came to their own kinsmen and intermixed with them. Their culture and civilization were the same. The Pañcha-Dasyu-Kuśikas; after their coalescence with the Pañcha-Prāchyas" became full-fledged Ikṣvākus as they originally were.

Mahāvīra Nāgaputra

The corroborative evidence of this Iksvāku-Ahi and Ikṣvāku coalescence comes from a curious quarter. Mahāvīra, the twentyfourth Jaina Tīrthaṁkara, belonged to the Ikṣvāku race. He was of Kaśyapa Gotra and Nāyaputra, a scion of the Nāyas. Nāyaputra has wrongly been translated as jñatṛputra so far. The correct translation of the Prākṛta word "Nāya" is not jñatṛ but Nāga Nāya means Nāga and Nāyaputta means Nāgaputra Mahāvīra was not jñatṛputra but he was Nāgaputra[75] All the three epithets of Mahāvīra are of great historical importance. He was an Iksvāku, a Nāga and a Kāśyapa, the descendant of Kaśyapa, the progenitor of the Nāga or Ahi race. It appears that when the Pañcha-

70 B C Law, North India in the sixth century B. C. (in the Age of Imperial Unity); 1953, page 4.

71. B. C. Law, Tribes in Ancient India; 1943; page 158.

72. K. P. Jayaswal; Hindu Polity; 1955, page 183.

73. B. C. Law, op. cit. ; page 278.

74. B. C Law; Mahāvīra; page 19.

75. Ācharya Tulsi & Muni Nathmal; Jain Bharati (Hindi) Vol 10 Number 46 dated 18. 11. 1962; page 892.

Dasyu-Kuśikas, the Ikṣvāku-Ahis; had finally merged in the Pañcha-prāchyas, the pure Ikṣvākus; the epithet Nāga assumed importance also in this region. Mahāvīra immortalised this historical event by assuming to himself the epithet Nāga.

Anga and Vaṅga, so much detested by the Brahmāryans were very holy to the Jainas. They top the list of the sixteen Mahājnapadas [76] and the first two amongst the "Pure Regions." Their capitals respectively were Chapā and Tāmralipti. [77] The word Tāmralipti is of Austric origin. It bordered the territories of Kāmarūpa. The word Kāmarūpa is also of Austric origin. [78] The words Anga, Vanga and Kaliṅga might have their origins in the Austric language. [79] These pre-Āryan and pre-Dravidian proto-Australoid people were of the Ikṣvāku race. Aṅga, Vaṅga and Kaliṅga, the most impure regions to the Brahmāryans, were the purest regions for the śramaṇic Ikṣvākus. The people of Aṅga, Vanga, Kaliṅga, Puṇḍra and Suhma were not the eastern branches of the Ānavas who never migrated from the west to the east. They were the pure Ikṣvākus, termed as Prāchyas and Asuras; who held their sway till the Gupta period when they were utterly routed. The Brāhmaṇa power advancing from the west to the east forced them into political and cultural submission circa 300 A. D.

4. THE MINOR PRĀCHYAS

Kuru-Pāñchāla Alliance

When the Brahmāryans settled in the Brahmāvarta and, in association with their converts, redacted the Ṛgveda circa 1000 B. C., the whole of the country east to Ahisthala was populated by the Prāchyas or the Dānavas. The Brahmāvarta people occupied the territories around the Saraswatī and Dṛṣadvatī

76. B. C. Law; op. cit (N. I. S. C. in A. I. U.), page 1.

77. Āchārya Vijayendrasuri; Tīrthaṁkara Mahāvīra Vol I; 1960 page 42.

78. Sylvain Levi; op. cit; page 116, 119.

79. B. Kikati; Certain Austric-Sanskrit. Word-correspondence; New Indian Antiquary Vol VI (1943-44); page 60.

regions. It comprised the regions of Kurukṣetra and Kuru-jāṅgala; the modern eastern Punjab and northern Rajasthan. The Kuru king Janamejaya in the ninth century B. C. had not extended his sway beyond the Brahmāvarta region though he exercised political authority in the west and the north upto Taxila. The Pāñchāla King Durmukha made extensive conquests in every direction.[80] Pāñchāla, thus, appears to be an independant country in the earlier part of the seventh century B. C. Durmukha's military expeditions appear to have touched the Kurus We may also conjecture some combats between the Kurus and the Pāñchālas. But ultimately the peace was forged between the two contending parties and the Kurus and the Pāñchālas became allies. It appears that both formed a sort of political confederation. The Aitareya Brāhmana that extols the military activities of Durmukha also mentions the kings of Kuru-Pāñchālas.[81] The Kuru-Pāñchāla alliance might have been effected in the later part of the seventh century B. C.

Śūrasenakas

The Śūrasenakas had their capital at Mathurā, a great city of long antiquity. They occupied the territory of Mathura district and possibly some of the territory still farther south[82] The Śūrasena country lay to the east of the Matsyas. They claimed their descent from the Yadus mentioned in the Rgveda. Śūrasena was one of the sixteen Mahājanapadas. The Śūrasena Janapada was occupied by Vṛṣṇis and Andhakas, branches of the Yadu tribe. Śūrasena janapada was a republican corporation. Śūrasena was an independant republic till it merged in the Magadhan empire in the third century B. C.[83] Śūrasena has not been mentioned in the Brāhmaṇical literature before Pānini's time circa 450 B. C. It appears that Śūrasena did not come under the Brāhmanical influence till the fall of

80. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa; 8. 23.

81 Aitareya Brāhmaṇa; 8. 14.

82. B. C. Law; op. cit (T. A. I); page 39.

83. B. C. Law; North India in Sixth century B. C. (A. I. U.); page 12.

the Magadhan empire. The brāhmanization of the Yadu territory of Śūrasena republic can not be placed before second century B. C.

The Matsyas had belonged to the Ahi race. We find one Dhvasana Dvaitavana, a king of Matsya following the Brāhmaṇic yajñic way. [84] The Matsyas were brāhmanised in the seventh century B. C.

Brahmarṣideśa

Manu defines Brahmāvarta as the holy land, created by gods, which is between the two divine rivers Saraswatī and Drsadvatī. [85] This is perfectly true. The country which lies between the Himavat and the Vindhya mountains to the east of Prayāga and to the west of Vināśana (the place where the river Saraswatī disappears) is called Madhyadeśa. [86] Manusmṛti was compiled circa 200 A. D. The Brahmāryans held no sway beyond Prayāga till 200 B. C. This statement also appears to be correct. The plains of the Kurus, the country of the Matsyas, Pāñchālas and Śūrasenakas thse formed indeed the country of the Brahmarṣis (Brāhmaṇical sages) according to Manu, immediately after Brahmāvarta. [87] This statement of Manu appears to be partially wrong.

Sūrsenakas not in Brahmarṣideśa

The Śūrasenakas were not brāhmaṇised till the second century B. C. The conception of brahmarṣis ceased to exist after the period of the early Upaniṣads in the sixth century B. C. The Brahmarṣis denote those Ṛṣis who composed the basic Vedic literature which concept may in no case be extended beyond the early Upaniṣadic age. Śūrasena was anti-brāhmaṇical till this period. The Brahmarṣideśa till the Upaniṣadic period could comprise only of Kurukṣetra, Pāñchāla and Matsya regions. Brahmarṣidesa of the Purāṇic age could include the republic of Śūrasenakas but that is not

84. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa; 13. 5. 4. 9.

85. Manusmṛti; 2. 17.

86. Manusmṛti; 2. 21.

87. Manusmṛti; 2. 19.

what Manu means. He perhaps included the Śūrasena territory in his difinition of Brahmarsidesa as Mathurā, the ancient city of great repute having significant associations with the Śramanic religion, could not be obliterated from history and the Brahmāryans could not control the temptation of such a city of high intellectual and spiritual repute from inclusion in the territory of the Brāhmana sages. This inclusion of Śūrasena republic in Brahmarṣidesa gave Brāhmaṇical literature edifying religious legends; so pointedly mentioned by Pargiter, that helped them in constructing their false history on the ruins of the true history of their vanquished adversaries The association of Śūrasena with Brāhmaṇical culture is just like the association of Purūravas and Puru, son of Yayāti, with Prayāga and Kāśī. Prayāga was associated with them because it was the centre of their culture in the Purānic age circa 300 A. D. The subsequent position of Prayāga misled the Purānas' last editors[88] in associating Prayāga with them Similarly the last position of Śūrasena in the second century B. C led Manu to wrongly associate it with Brahmarṣidesa. Brahmarsideśa, by this time, had been replaced by Madhyadeśa and had already gone out of history. Śūrasena was wrongly tacked afterwards with Brahmarṣideśa..[89] Śūrasena republic was never a constituent of Brahmarṣideśa.

Satvants

The Satvants are a branch of the Yadu tribe. They belonged to the south The Satvants are said to have prepared for an Aśvamedha. They were defeated by Bharata who carried away their horse.[90] Bharata Dauṣyanti existed long before Satvant and his son Bhīma Sātavata[91] and could not come in conflict with the Satvants. Satvant stands down by twentyone degrees from Bharata. Rāma's brother Śatrughna

88. C. V. Vaidya; Solar and Lunar Kṣatriya Races in Vedas, IBBRAS Vol 23 (1914) page 48-49.

89. Aitareya Brāhmana; 8. 14. 3.

90. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 13. 5. 4. 21.

91. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit (A. I. H. T.) page 146.

killed Lavana son of Madhu.[92] Lavaṇa was a Rākṣasa as his father was. But Satvant was four degrees down to Madhu. Hence Satvants could not have been defeated during Rāma's age. The legend of the carrying of the sacrificial horse of the Satvants is a pure myth without any historical foundation. The Satvants, further, could not perform the Yajña. It appears that the Satvants did not find favour with the Brahmāryans till Śatapatha times, i.e. the sixth century B. C. The Satvants are not allowed to peform Aśvamedha. The bringing in of Bharata Dauṣyanti or Rāma's brother Śatrughna is only a fairy tale. The Satvants appear in history later in post-Vedic age. They were largely associated with the southern regions. They played their part in historical times. Their association with the past is only a case of Brāhmaṇical transferance for creating edifying religious legends.

Chedis

The Chedi people are mentioned in the Ṛgveda. One Kasu Chaidya is a liberal donor. He gave in Dāna 100 camels, 10000 cows, ten slaves and gold. There was no other pious man, a more liberal benefactor.[93] The Chedis under Kasu Chaidya appear to have been brāhmanised in the eleventh century B. C. before the redaction of the Ṛgveda. The epic Chedis lived in Bundelakhand. It is suggested that in the Vedic times they were probably situated in much the same locality[94] But this identification appears to be wrong. The Ṛgveda does not know the Śūrasenakas and the Satvants. The Rgvedic people had not advanced beyond the Matsya regior either to the east or to the south. It was certainly impossible for them to know the people beyond these boundaries. The Rgvedic sages did not know the Chedis of Bundelakhand. Bundelakhand was not the home of the Vedic Chedis and their leader Kasu Chaidya. The Chedis in the epic are associatedwith the Matsyas. According to the the Purānic tradition; the Chedis were Yādavas and the Paurava Vasu Uparichara conquered

92. F. E. Pargiter ; op. cit (A. I. H. T) Page 170.

93. Ṛgveda 8. 1. 5. 37-39.

94. Macdonell & Keith ; Vedic Index ; Vol I page 263.

Yādava kingdom of the Chedi. The Chedi is also said to have descended from Paurava Vāsava.[95] Thus the Chedis become associated with the Yadus and Pūrus of the Ṛgvedic fame who were Dānava and belonged to the Ikṣvāku-Ahi race. The Pūrus of the Ṛgveda inhabited the upper Saraswatī region and the Yadus the lower Saraswatī region. It appears that the Chedis inhabited the region lying east of the joint Saraswatī-Dṛṣadvatī stream and south-west of Matsya.

Matsyagandhā legend

The Rgveda associates two important historical events with the Chedis. One Parāśara played active role in the Dāśarājña war Parāśara was the destroyer of hundres of Rākṣasas.[96] Parāśara was such a great destroyer that his name became equated with violence. Indra is Parāśaraḥ, the discomfiter.[97] His alleged son purānic Vyāsa does not find any place in the Ṛgveda. The Ṛgveda was redacted 100 years after the conclusion of the Dāśarājña war The purānic tradition maintains that Achhodā was born as a Dāseyī from king Vasu of Chedi as a fish and she became Satyavatī, mother of Vyāsa by Parāśara and of Vichitravīrya and Chitrāngadā by Śāntanu[98] Her virgin name was Matsyagandhā. She was born from a fish in the river Yamunā. Her twin brother was Matsya. She was a glamorous girl. She was driving Parāśara in a boat to the other bank of the Yamunā. Parāśara fell in love with her in the boat and had sexual intercourse with her. She became the virgin mother of Vyāsa and became Gandhavatī from Matsyagandhā.[99] The legend centres round river Yamunā and the Matsya region

Vegetarian Yajñas

The Brahmāryans had been offering living animals in the Yajñas. When they converted many of the original people

95. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit (A.I.H.T.); pages 104, 118, 281, 294.
96. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1. 21.
97. (1) Ṛgveda 7. 6. 16. 21.
(2) Ṛgveda Samhitā (V. S. M.) Vol. III page 516.
98. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit (A. I. H. T.); page 69–70.
99. Mahābhārata (Cr. Ed); 1. 57. 47–48, 50, 55, 67–69.

following the faith of non-violence; the practice of offering animals in Yajñas became repulsive and reprehensible. Yādava or Pūru Kasu had become a Brahmāryan convert after the Dāśarājña war. He made a great Yajña in which nothing living was offered, [100] though he donated his wealth and possessions liberally. The Vedic Kasu Chaidya may be identified with Vasu Chaidya. Such a change in name was not improbable in the Purāṇic age. Vedic Lomaśā became Purānic Romaśā, [101] and Vedic Kasu became Purānic Vasu. The Vedic, the epic and the Purāṇic evidences go to prove that the Chedis lived near the Matsyas near Yamunā and they introduced the element of non-violence in the violent Vedic sacrifices. The Chedis, of the Ikṣvāku-Ahi race, coalesced with the Brahmāvarta people in the eleventh century B. C.

Eastern Migration of the Chedis

Vasu's descendants appear to have migrated to the east in the early part of the first millennium B. C. They settled in the eastern part of Bundelakhand. The epic speaks of these Chedis of Bundelakhand. According to Chetiya jātaka, [102] Upachara was grandson of Mandhātā. His five sons established kingdoms of Hathipura, Assapura, Sīhapura, Uttarapāñchāla and Daddarpur. They may be identified with kingdoms of Kuru, Gāndhāra, Anga, Pāñchāla and Nāga kingdom of Dardistan. [103] Assapura has been identified with a town in Anga also. [104] Then the Chedi migration to Gāndhāra becomes improbable. All other regions lie to the east of the region of the Vedic Chedis. This Buddhist Upachara has been identified with the Purānic Paurava Vasu Uparichara. After Upachara, the Chedis sunk into unimportance since with Bṛhadratha, the eldest son of Vasu, according to the Purāṇas, Magadha takes a prominent part in traditional history. Though Chedi was one of the sixteen Mahājanapadas

100. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit. (A. I. H. T.) page 316.
101. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit. (A I. H. T.) page 316.
102. B. A. Kauśalyāyana Chetiya Jātaka (422); Vol. IV page 114.
103. Ratilal N. Mehta; Pre-Buddhist India; 1939; page 18.
104 H. C. Roychowdhari; op. cit ; page 130.

in sixth century B. C., it appears to have been of smaller importance. No Chedi king or leader plays an important role in this age.

Vaśas

The Vaśas are a people mentioned in the Ṛgveda. Their country lay to the east of Kuruksetra. The Vatsas or Vaśas of Kauśāmbī are a later and different people. Vaśas were connected with the Matsyas and the Śalvas.[105] Elsewhere Vaśas are connected with Matsyas, Kurus, Uśīnaras and Pāñchālas.[106] These Vaśa people are associated with the Iksvāku Ahi or Ahi people They appear to be a minor people. They coalesced with the Brahmāryans in the Ṛgvedic age. Vaśa son of Aśva is protected by Aśvins.[107] He also receives gifts.[108] The later Vatsas of Kauśāmbī belonged to the Iksvāku race. Macdonell and Keith place the Vaśas just in the north of Kuru region and south of the Uśīnaras between the rivers Yamunā and Gangā.[109]

---

105. Gopatha Brāhmana 1 2. 9
106. Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad 4. 1.
107. Ṛgveda 1. 16. 7 10; 1. 17 1. 21, 8. 2. 3. 20; 8. 4. 4. 14.
108. Ṛgveda 8. 6 4-21-23.
109. Macdonell and Keith; Vedic Index; Vol. I Map facing the front page.

CHAPTER VII

THE BRAHMA ETHNOLOGY

1. THE DEVAS

Characteristic of Devas

The undivided Āryans were divided into Ganas, the tribal collectivities The leader of a Gana was known as Ganapati. Ganapati presided over Devas, his sub-leaders. The rest were the common members of the Gana Devas constituted the Gana aristocracy The Devas were ordinary human beings taking birth, growing young, decaying old and finally dying just like any living object on earth. The Devas possessed head, face, eyes, cheek, hair, soulders, chest, abdomen, hands, feet and fingers just like ordinary men. They wore clothes and had their chariots, horses and weapons of war. They were very violent, exploitative and cruel war-lords. Their main activity was to win wealth and riches for their followers. [1]

Historical Interpretation of Henothesim Theory

The Āryan leaders and sub-leaders had derived their names from the phenomena of nature. They imitated these forces in the belief that they would imbibe in themselves the powers possessed by these forces. The words Indra, Agni, Varuna, Mitra, Dyaus, Pṛthvī, Rudra, Savitr and others represent one or the other force of nature. The supreme leader of any one Gana assumed any one of these names and his sub-leaders the rest of them. Varuna and Sūrya are subordinate to Indra. [2] Varuṇa and Aśvins prostrate before Viṣṇu. [3] Indra, Mitra, Varuṇa, Āryamān and Rudra do not transgress the edicts of Savitr. [4] All the Devas are supreme at some places and subordinate at others. No Deva is the first always

1. R. C. Jain; The Most Ancient Āryan Society; 1964; Chapter III.
2. Ṛgveda 1. 15. 8. 3.
3. Ṛgveda 1. 21. 17. 4.
4. Ṛgveda 2. 4. 6. 9.

and no one is the last always. Even the Devas of a decidedly inferior and limited character assume occasionally in the eyes of a devoted poet a supreme place above all other Devas including the highest like Indra, Agni and Varuṇa. This was quite natural in the very nature of the basic Āryan society. A particular Gana was presided over by Agni but it also had sub-leaders like Indra, Varuna and others. The other Gaṇa was presided over by Aryaman but it also had Indra, Agni and Rudra as sub-leaders. The different Ganas were presided over by Ganapatis assuming one or the other name of the forces of nature. No name was considered a great or low All the names inspired the primitive Āryans equally. When one Gana assumed sovereignty over the other Gana in war or through peace; the ideas of great or low began to arise. The Ganapatis of the defeated Ganas began to be degraded and given inferior positions in the amalgamated higher Gaṇa. This historical fact has not so far been observed by the oriental scholars Maxmuller read in the celestialised Devas the worship of one god after another. The gods worshipped as supreme by each sect stand still side by side. He proposed the name Kathenotheism or Henotheism [5] to this aspect of Deva-hood He missed the real historical significance of the early Āryan life due to the Vedic gloss of the ritualisation and celestialisation. The primitive tribal collectives of the undivided Āryans had various Gaṇas headed by different military war-lords who, under the strong impact of spiritual culture of their adversaries, were later celestialised which led Maxmüller to wrongly propound his Henotheism theory

The Āryan Ganas, headed by Ganapatis and supported by the sub-leaders, the Devas, penetrated west Asia circa 2000 B. C They came from the north and first occupied Cappadocia in Asia minor and Iran. They, by and by, extended their sway over the rest of west Asia. The supreme Āryan sovereigns supported by the nobility class politically subjugated the whole of west Asia by the middle of the second millennium B. C. The whole of west Asia crawled under the violence of the Hittites, the Kassites and the Hurrians and

5. F. Maxmuller; The Vedas; 1956; page 85.

other minor groups of the Āryans. When the Āryans in West Asia mingled with the indigenous people, they found their culture superior to their own which could withstand the influences of the original culture. The original culture of west Asia triumphed over that of the foreign Āryan invaders.

The original Āryan society that advanced to Bhārata from west Asia was a homogenous unit. It was a universal tribal collective termed as Brahma. The undivided Brahma society constituted mostly of the Āryan blood though some minor non-Āryan blood might have crept in due to social contacts or conversions. Devas were the prominent leaders of the Brahma society who later became Ṛṣis[6] and Brāhmanas.[7] They stand at the foundation of the Brahma, the Brāhmaṇa and the later Varnic ethnology.

2. THE ASURAS

Triumph of Śramanic Culture

When the Ganapatis, Devas and their military hordes won political victory in west Asia and settled to peaceful life; they came in contacts with the original people. The original people had also to make peace with their political masters. This amalgamation of the two peoples brought their cultures face to face. The Materialists of the Mountains had brought their Materialistic culture and civilization. West Asia was then, under the influence of the Śramanic culture. The Materialist and the Śramanic cultures reacted upon each other and when history records the celebration of the triumph of the original culture upon that of the peoples of the mountains, [8] it refers to the victory of the Śramaṇic culture over the Materialistic culture of the foreign masters.

Origin of Asura

When the Asiāryans poured down upon West Asia; Varuna was their supreme leader. Varuṇa was a leader of the undivided Āryan society. Indra is only a late Irānāryan leader

6. Ṛgveda 1. 22. 8. 15.

7. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 2. 2. 2. 6; 2. 4. 3. 14.

8. S. Moscate; The Face of the Ancient Orient; 1960; page 156.

subordinate to Varuna who enjoys his sovereignty over the whole Irānāryan society till circa 1400 B. C. Varuṇa and his subordinate Devas had established their political sovereignty by methods of violence, exploitation and knaivity. The Ṛgveda records that in ancient times Varuna slew Vrtra.[9] Varuna, alongwith Indra destroyed Vṛtras.[10] Varuna was destroyer of foes.[11] Varuna possessed all wealths.[12] The culture of peace of west Asia had begun slowly penetrating the rulers. Varuna and Mitra renounced methods of violence and became righteous, peaceful and moral leaders of their society. They adopted the epithet Asura. Varuna and Mitra were great sovereigns and Asuras amongst the Devas.[13] They remained Asuras amongst the Devas,[14] possibly even after the final cleavage. The Asuras became weaponless.[15] They renounced the Cult of the weapon. The violent Āryans became peaceful, non-violent people due to the impact of the culture of their adversaries; the Śramanic culture.

These Śramanised Devas adopted the epithet Asura to denote their changed way of life. The epithet Asura in the Rgveda is used in the sense of wise, illustrious, powerful, mighty, supreme knowledge, life-bestowing, great renown, life-giver, invigorator, irresistible, strong, great, lord and conqueror The Zend Avesta uses the epithet Ahura in the same sense. The word Asura or Ahura in the sense of most supreme, the greatest, goes to the undivided Irānāryan period.

The word Asura is alleged to be a compound word with prefix 'A' to the word 'Sura' in the negative sense. But we do not meet with the word sura either in the Rgveda or the Zend Avesta. The word "surā", in the sense of intoxicant, appears

---

9. Ṛgveda 6. 6. 7 3.
10. Ṛgveda 7. 5. 13. 1.
11. Ṛgveda 2. 3. 5. 10; 2. 3. 6. 7.
12. Ṛgveda 8. 5 12. 1.
13. Ṛgveda 1. 21 12. 4; 7. 3. 3. 2; 8. 4. 5. 4.
14. Ṛgveda 7. 4. 10. 2.
15. Ṛgveda 1. 10. 3. 9.

in the Ṛgveda. [16] Varuna himself was a great Soma-drinker in the initial stages. The new influences sharply reacted upon him and he led the revolt against Soma-drinking. He degraded the word Soma to the word Surā and classified it along with wrath, gambling and ignorance, the causes of sin. Soma-drinking had deeply ingrained in the exuberant Irānāryan victors, the vices of wrath, gambling and ignorance. The equivalent word "Hurā" also appears in the Avesta. [17] Yāska also understands the word in the sense of an intoxicant. [18] Soma was a very good intoxicant and was not associated with evil, as later on, in these days. It was positively associated with good. Surā was an object of use for people. The good Surā was used by the good people. The good people were known as Devas who drank Soma. The word "Sura" has not at all been used in the Rgveda but Yāska etymolises this word. It appears that this word came in popular vogue during his times in the seventh century B. C. He traces the word Sura to √Su in the sense of good. [19] The good people came to be called suras. The good drink of the suras was Surā The Surā-drinkers were the suras. The Soma-drinking Devas were Suras. That section of the society which adopted the original Śramaṇic way renounced Soma-drinking. Varuṇa and Mitra, alongwith their followers, gave up Soma-drinking. These Devas who did not drink surā or Soma came to be called Asuras. No reproach or calumny was attached to the word Asura in this age but Soma-drinking definitely came to be looked down in west Asia till the continuance of Varuna sovereignty. The goodness of the Surā-drinkers was transferred to the non-Surā-drinkers. An objection may be raised that when we do not meet the word Sura either in the Ṛgveda or the Avesta, why this arbitrary for-

16. (1) Ṛgveda 7. 5. 16. 6.
(2) Ṛgveda Saṁhitā (V. S. M.); Vol. III, page 469. Surā Pramādakāriṇī the Intoxicant.

17. A. F. Khabardar, New Light on the Gathas of Holy Zarthusthra; 1951; page 768.

18. Nirukta; 1. 11.

19. Nirukta; 3. 3.

mation of Asura from Sura in the negative sense ? The word Surā is a Vedic word, hence we may not doubt that the word Sura could also be a Vedic word. The word Sura was not given prominence in the Vedic literature as the word Deva was then reigning supreme. Surā had not divided the homogenous Irānāryan society. The non-Surā-drinker Devas were raised to a high social status in the society. The Surā-drinker Devas accepted a junior position but the society still remained homogenous. The word Surā was only a derisive word for Soma but the wise leaders of the Irānāryan society did not permit the disruption of their society on that count. The word Sura was not given prominence to keep the social unity intact. The Surā-drinking Devas favourably reacted to this change and voluntarily accepted the superiority of the non-Surā-drinking Devas. To say that the word Sura is a classical Sanskrit word only is to ignore the Rgvedic history The stress was meant to be given on to a particular way, not to the person. The word Sura gained prominence in later history when the cleavage was complete and the emphasis was transferred from the way to the persons or their social groupings. But the √Su gave birth to the word Surā and to the word Asura in the negative sense, not in a bad sense but in a qualitative and illustrious sense reflecting the then social conditions. Varuna and Mitra had now become the righteous and moral leaders of the Āryan society in west Asia. The word Asura became a dignified and illustrious word with them and all the leaders of the society adopted this word. The word Asura to the undivided Irānāryans meant great power, great prestige and great glory.

Asuras are Pūrva-Devas

The Devas of the undivided Āryan society became Asuras in the Irānāryan age. The Rgvedic record keeps the chronology of the Devas and the Asuras intact. Devas are former and ancient to Asuras in point of time. The former Devas later became Asuras under the impact of the Śramaṇic culture. The Asuras are former Devas.[20] Agni is a former Deva

20. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 4. 7.

proceeding to the place of the aggregation of wealth [21] and Agni, as later noted is an Asura. The ancients have been equated with Devas who kindled Agni and Agni is true to them. [22] It appears that the Irānāryans had brought their Agni cult with them. Neither the ancients, nor their successors, nor the recents attained the prowess of Indra. [23] This Ṛc contains in itself all the three stages of the development of the Irānāryan society. The first are the ancients, the Devas. The second are their successors, the Asuras. The third are the new additions, the recents, the converts from the original people. The ancient followers of Indra, the Devas, were exempt from blame and were irreproachable and unharmed. [24] The memory of the pure Āryans and the new converts has also been preserved at another place in the Rgveda. The ancients and the recents both originated praises for Indra. [25] Asuras are remembered as former Devas till very late times. [26] Sāyana also identifies Asura with Deva and Deva with Asura. [27] The Pūrva-devas have now become the Deva-Asuras.

Deva-Asuras

The Irānāryan Asuras had inherited great qualities of head and heart from their adversaries. They became non-violent people by abjuring force of the sword. Sons of Asuras are very powerful and generous. [28] Asuras were endowed with Māyā. They were wisdom all. [29] Asura Varuna is possessor

21. Ṛgveda 5. 1. 3. 8.
22. Ṛgveda 5. 2. 11. 2.
23. Ṛgveda 5. 3. 10. 6.
24. Ṛgveda 6. 2. 4. 4.
25. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 5. 9.
26. Amarakoṣa; 1. 12.
27. (1) Ṛgveda 5. 6. 11. 6; 7. 1. 4. 7.
(2) Ṛgveda Saṁhitā (V. S. M.); Vol. II page 986; Vol III page 321.
28. Ṛgveda 1. 18. 2. 2; 3. 4. 15. 7; 8. 10. 4. 1.
29. (1) Ṛgveda 5. 5. 7. 3. 7.
(2) Ṛgveda Saṁhitā (V. S. M.); Vol. II. pages 938–939.

of all wealth.[30] He mitigates evil.[31] Asura Indra is scatterer of foes, possessor of wealth and giver of strength.[32] Asura Indra is giver of wealth[33] Asura Indra is repelled of enemies and giver of rain.[34] Asura Dyaus excludes the wicked and bows to Indra.[35] Rudra is Asura, the life bestower.[36] The Maruts, sons of Rudra, are Asuras, the conquerers of their foes.[37] Asura Agni is productive of food and progeny.[38] Agni is Rudra, the expeller (Asura) of foes from heaven[39] Asura Agni is parent of sacrifice.[40] Agni is Asura, the invigorator of the wise.[41] Agni is Asura, strong.[42] Agni sends his voice upwards and downwards as Asura (Sun) diperses his rays.[43] Asura Savitṛ, expeller of foes from heaven, drives away Rākṣasas and Yātudhānas[44] Asura Savitṛ grants dwelling to the offerer[45] Asura Suparna has illuminated the three worlds[46] Asura Vāyu is bestower of happiness.[47] Asura Pūsan is scatterer of foes and bestower of prosperity.[48] Asura Soma has made the three

30. Ṛgveda 8. 5. 12 1
31. Rgveda 1. 6. 1. 14.
32. Ṛgveda 1. 23. 10. 1.
33 Ṛgveda8. 8. 9. 10. 6
34 Rgveda 1. 10. 4. 3.
35 Rgveda 1. 19 5. 1
36. Rgveda 5 3. 10 11.
37. Ṛgveda 1. 11. 7. 2.
38. Ṛgveda 4. 1. 2 5.
39 Ṛgveda 2 1. 1. 6.
40. Rgveda 3 1. 3. 4.
41. Ṛgveda 5. 2 1. 1.
42 Ṛgveda 7. 2. 13. 3, 7. 1. 2 3
43. Ṛgveda 8. 3. 7. 23.
44. Ṛgveda 1. 7. 6. 10; 5 4. 6. 2.
45. Ṛgveda 4. 5. 8. 1.
46. Ṛgveda 1. 7. 5. 7.
47. Ṛgveda 3. 3. 10. 1.
48. Ṛgveda 5. 4. 7. 11.

worlds exalted.[49] Viśvedevas, the Asuras, are possessors of wealth and distributors of riches.[50] Maruts grant male perogeny vigorous and intelligent (Asura).[51] These activities and functions of the Deva Asuras significantly depict their peaceful character. They are very little associated with violence and plunder so characteristic of the Āryans.

Schism

The Deva Asuras in West Asia stood united under the leadership of Varuna till 1400 B. C. Hittite-Mittani war was fought circa 1365 B. C.[52] The Mittanis lost the war. This event is recorded in Boghaz-Keui inscriptions which reveal the supremacy of Varuna and Mitra over Indra and Nāsatyas.[53] Varuna and Indra and all other subordinate Devas were united in a single Brahma or their universal tribal collective and they were all Asuras. The defeat of the Mittanis gave a new upsurge to the Irānāryans. That section of the Irānāryan society who did not fully subscribe to the peaceful ways of Varuna set a dessenting note and started considering afresh the ways and means of again establishing their political supremacy. They reorganised for fresh military victories. The violent and aggressive section of the undivided Irānāryans denounced the leadership of peaceful Varuṇa and Mitra. They accepted the leadership of war-loving, aggressive and adventurous Indra and Agni. Indra and his associates, the Deva-Asuras; the leaders of the Brahmāryans; an offshoot of the Irānāryans, could not keep company with the peaceful weaponsless Deva-Asuras and abondoned them.[54] They again took to the weapon-cult. The Asuras also began to prepare the Soma juice.[55] The initial schism has occurred but there was no final schism in

49. Ṛgveda 9 4. 6. 1.
50. Ṛgveda 8. 4. 7. 20.
51. Ṛgveda 7. 4. 1. 24
52. S. Moscate; op. cit ; page 190.
53. James, B. Pritchard; Ancient Near Eastern Texts; Relating to Old Testament; 1955; page 206.
54. Ṛgveda 8. 10. 3. 9.
55. Ṛgveda 1. 16. 3. 6.

culture. Indra and his associate Devas advancing east to Bhārata still remained Deva-Asuras. The word Asura has been used in the Ṛgveda for more than 115 times but ninety per cent, it has been used in good sense It is used in a bad sons only in a few cases. It appears that Deva-Asura culture had so dominated the Āryans in Irān that they could not altogether do away with it. The use of the epithet Asura had been made in an illustrious sense and that tradition could not die so soon. The Brahmāryans won final victory in the Dāśarājña war circa 1100 B. C. and settled in their new home. The followers of their arch-enemy Viśvāmitra, along with others, had coalesced with them. Sons of Asura had begun bestowing riches upon Viśvāmitra now [56]

Fall of Asura

We have earlier noticed that Indra had to contend with enemies whether Āryas or Dāsas. He might have to contend with his erstwhile Asura brothers. The Rgveda preserves the remniscences of such conflicts. The word Asura has been used in the Ṛgveda only 10 or 15 times in the sense of an enemy Ṛṣi Vasiṣṭha started the process. He made Asura Agni, the Asūraghna Agni. [57] Bharadvāja, the Bārhaspatya, originally a convert and later an Āngirasa Ṛsi, makes Asura Indra, the Asuraghna Indra, the subduer of foes, abounding in wealth [58] Bṛhaspati, the chief of Asura warriors (Asurasya Vīrān), is respresented as piercing the Asura warriors with his shaft in the like manner as he did formerly slay Vrtra by his prowess. He is now prayed to destroy the enemies. [59] The Asuras are rendered here as enemies. They also now appear as related to Vṛtras. The Soma plant in its original form has Asura-like colour which he loses in the process of extractaction and becomes green-tinted. He guards against the Rākṣasas. [60] Indra and Viṣṇu demolished the 99 strong cities of Śambara ·

56. Ṛgveda 3. 4. 15. 7.
57. Ṛgveda 7. 1. 13. 1.
58. Ṛgveda 6. 2. 7. 4.
59. Ṛgveda 2. 3. 8. 4.
60. Ṛgveda 9. 4. 4. 1–2.

they slew at once without resistance the hundred thousand heroes of Asura Varchin.[61] We have earlier noticed that Śambara and Varchin are Dāsas and also Dasyus. Dāsas and Dasyus are, here, equated with Asuras. The most peaceful Varuṇa, endowed with real Asura wisdom, is also made the destroyer of Asuras or their relations.[62]

Final Cleavage

The Asura Brahmāryans of Bhārata had engaged in minor skirmishes with their erstwhile kinsmen, the Asura Irānāryans of Iran. The west Asian Asuras were vying with the political power of the Deva-Asuras of Bhārata. Asura queen Sammuramat of Assyia in west Asia led an expedition into Bhārata in the later ninth or earlier eight century B. C.,[63] where she was offered a desperate resistance and her forces were utterly routed with only twenty soldiers alive. This great event finds a minor place in the historical records but it played the most important part in the future Irano-Brahma relations. This historic battle gave a very revolting experience to the Bhāratīya Deva-Asuras. This battle widened further the schism earlier effected in the Irānāryan society and brought the final cleavage.

The Ṛgveda clearly depicts this final cleavage. The Asuras, after their defeat, lost all their wisdom. The Devas overcame them. They preserved their Deva-hood after killing the Asuras.[64] The Tenth Maṇḍala of the Ṛgveda composed circa 800 B. C. refers Indra not only as Vṛtra-hā, Amitra-hā, Sapatna-hā and Dasyu-hā but also as Asura-hā.[65] Indra is not depicted as Asura-hā in the main body of Ṛgveda. He becomes Asura-hā very late. Asura, enjoying great power, prestige and glory, was "dethroned in the Tenth-Maṇḍala of the Ṛgveda, an influence of time."[66] The Tenth Maṇḍala of the Ṛgveda was

61. Ṛgveda 7. 6. 10. 5.
62. Ṛgveda 5. 6. 13. 5.
63. Buddhaprakash; Vṛtra: A. B. O. R. I. Vol. 30 page 177.
64. Ṛgveda 10. 4. 11. 4; 10. 10. 12. 5; 10. 12. 6. 4.
65. Ṛgveda 10. 12. 19. 2.
66. Siddheswar Varma; The Etymologies of Yāska; 1953; page 3.

appended to the main body circa 800 B. C. This historical cleavage has also been echoed in the religious literature of the two peoples. Zoroastrianism extols the Asura and decries the Deva. Asura is a beneficent god and Deva, a destructive demon in Zoroastrianism. The opposite occurs in the Tenth Mandala of the Rgveda. Here Deva is a beneficant god and Asura, a destructive demon. This cleavage between the Rgvedic religion and the Zoroastrianism happened towards the end of the Rgvedic period. The enmity became bitter and bitter in the post-Ṛgvedic times. [67] Varuna reigned supreme in Iran and Mitra travelled even upto Europe in the later part of the first millennium B. C

Linguists on Asura

We thus find that the process of abomination of the word Asura started circa 800 B. C The evil sense began to be attached to it. The linguists were not far off to justify the popular bad sense of the word Asura. Yāska clearly saw the good and the bad sense of the word Asura; he derived both the meanings of the word Asura from the word itself. He had no idea of time and was ignorant of historical outlook He gave popular etymology to the word Asura in its later pejorative sense—as a+Su+ratāh "not very happy." The word has been traced to √As, lit, "thrown out of their positions" He has also given the real correct derivation of the word to √As "to throw" "life being thrown into the body." It is interpreted as "Powerful Lord," having connection with Avestic "Ahū" "Lord" The word is also traced to "Asu" with a possessive suffix 'r' lit, "full of energy of spirit." [68] If "body" is taken to be an inanimate object, the "throwing of life" into it means the association of the body with the soul or the union of spirit and matter. Here the spiritual aspect is emphasised. Asura means a person full of spiritual qualities. The later Brahmāryan Pundits arbitrarily created the word 'Sura' in an unjustified manner by isolating the

67. V. K. Rajavade; Asura, Proceedings and Transactions of the first Oriental Conference; Poona; 1922; page 19.

68. Siddheswar Varma; op. cit.; pages 3, 27, 126.

initial 'a' from the word Asura.[69] This Brāhmaṇic arbitrariness betrays the rules of grammer and brutally twists history. Yāska led this process of twisting of history in the linguistic field. There was no need of giving any popular etymology to the word Asura in this arbitrary manner. Had he fully known and appreciated real history, he could have derived the good sense of the word Asura from √Su; also deriving the word Sura from the same root. But he fell pray to false popular stories in ignorance of history. The words Sura and Asura both carry in the Brahmāryan sense, good meanings The illustrious word Asura was degraded very late for which no grammatical pun was necessary The analysis of historical events could have done the task. Yāska fell in this error on account of the absence of the word Sura specifically in the Rgveda. The absence of the word Sura in the Rgveda had led several scholars to give mechanistic meanings to the word Asura It has been suggested that the primitive conception of "magic" "occult" power underlies the word Asura The Vedic word Asura is much older than the classical Sanskrit word Sura; Asura does not represent the oppsite of Sura, (= god). The word was originally used in the Vedic literature in the sense of a being possessing the highest occult power.[70] This is only a partial truth. It is right to maintain that the word Asura does not represent the opposite of Sura. The Asura stood not only at par with Sura but very much above him. But the assumption that Sura is a classical Sanskrit word and Asura a Vedic word leads to some wrong conclusions. Sura may as well be a Vedic word The prefix 'a' to the word 'Sura' in the negative sense refers only to the difference of qualities. It, in the present context, does not denote contradiction or contrariness, The Asuras alone did not possess the highest occult powers. The Devas also possessed such occult powers. The difference between the Asura and the Deva sections of the undivided Irānāryan society were much more fundamental than this. The former

69. Sylvain Levi; Pre-Āryan and pre-Dravidian in India; 1929; page 132 Note 1.

70. R. N Dandekar; Asura Varuṇa; A.B.O R.I. Vol. 21 page 179.

renounced the cult of the weapon and Soma while the latter still adhered to them. This spiritual sense of the word Asura clearly proves that the Asuras were "Śramaṇised Devas." Both belonged to the Āryan racial stock.

Devāsura-Samgrāma a Myth

The Brāhmana literature throws illuminating light on the Deva and Asura problem. Though Asuras had begun to be looked down by the Devas they do not yet join the array of the Irānāryan adversaries, the Dāsas, the Dasyus, the Panis and the Vrtras. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa records a family found between the Devas and the Asuras but also records an arrangement entered between them.[71] The family feud between the Devas and the Asuras appears to have been insignificant or the memory of the Deva-Asura battle might have been obliterated by the Śatapatha times. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa definitely records that the tales and legends relating the fight between Devas and Asuras is not at all true[72] The Asuras are still distcint people from the Vrtras and the Rākṣasas. Mitra and Varuna smite not only Asuras but also Rākṣasas.[73] Both the Asuras and the Rāksasas impede the oblations.[74] The slaying of Vṛtra has numerously been averred;[75] but the Vṛtras and the Rākṣasas have nowhere been equated with Asuras. The Dāsas, the Dasyus and the Paṇis have not been referred in the Brāhmana literature. The earlier Upaniṣads, the Brhadāraṇyaka and the Chhāndogya, do not refer to the Vrtras, the Rākrasas, the Panis and the Dasyus. They refer to the Dāsas and the Dāsis[76] but not in the sense of an adversary.

71. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, 6 15.

72. Satapatha Brāhmaṇa; 11. 1. 6. 9.

73. Aitareya Brāhmana 6. 4.

74. Kausītakī Brāhmaṇa 28. 2.

75. (1) Aitareya Brāhmana 1. 26; 2. 4, 3. 16; 3. 20, 3. 21; 4. 22; 7. 28

(2) Kauṣītakī Brāhmaṇa; 7. 2; 8 2; 15. 2; 18. 9; 23. 2.

(3) Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 13. 4. 1. 13.

76. (1) Brhadāranyaka Upaniṣad 6. 2. 7; 4. 4. 23.

(2) Chhāndogya Upaniṣad 5. 13. 2; 7. 24. 2.

They have been used in the sense of slaves. It is, therefore quite clear that the Asura Āryans were slowly assuming a low position in society. They were also considered as enemies by the Deva Āryans but they still remained in the Brahmāryan society till, at least, the sixth century B. C. The Purāṇic tradition records great battles between the Devas and the Asuras. No battle between the Devas on one side and the Vṛtras, Rākṣasas, Dāsas, Dasyus and Panis on the other is recorded in the Puranas The Purānas, like the Ṛgveda, also do not record any battle between the Asuras and the Vṛtras, and their allies. The Purānas record battles only between the Devas and the Asuras. The ancient Purānas had wholly been recast in the Gupta period and imagination and fancy had played no lesser part in the fabrication of the Gupta recensions of Purāṇic history Asura Indra, Asura Agni and other Asura Devas are recorded in the Rgveda to have vanquished their adversaries the Vrtras, the Rāksasas, the Dāsas, the Dasyus and the Panis. This genuine history was brutally and ruthlessly falsified in the Purānic tradition. The Brahmāryan adversaries, the Vṛtras and their compatriots were equated with Asuras. Ahi Vrtra becomes Vrtrāsura; Dasyu Śambara becomes Śambarāsura; Pani Vala becomes Valāsura and Dāsa Varchin become Varchināsura in the Purānas It is in the Purāṇic age in the beginning of the Christian era that the epithet Asura was transferred to the Rgvedic adversaries of the Brahmāryan foreign invaders in a mischievous attempt to cast thick gloss on the real historical events. The Purānic tradition makes the Āryan Asuras non-Āryans to which racial stock they never belonged. The Asuras were never non-Āryans.

Non-Āryanisation of Āryan Asuras

The cause of this transference of the Āryan Asuras to the non-Āryan racial stock is very obvious. A section of the Irānāryans, as stated earlier, had adopted the Śramaṇic culture of non-violence, peace and penance and had become moral and righteous people. The Asuras in the Purānas and Mahābhārata are associated with penance, self-control and other spiritual qualities. Twiṣṭṛ was a great penance-practising sage. Vṛtra, his son, belonged to a peaceful family and

practised penance for 60000 years.[77] Vala was his real brother.[78] Madhu, the father of the Asura race, practised great penances and possessed very high spiritual values.[79] Dhundhu, his son, was a great Tapasvī sage.[80] We may multify these instances by hundreds from the Mahābhārata and other Purānic literature where we find Asuras, Daityas and Dānavas practising penance. The Brahmāryan Devas never practised penance. Penance divided the Asuras from the Devas. It has been suggested that Indra incurred the sin of Brāhmanicide by killing Vrtra and Namuchi and these two famous Dānavas were Brāhmanas[81] But when Vrtra and Namuchi were killed, the Brahmāryans did not believe in the sanctity of penance and certainly they did not slay the Brāhmanas of their own racial stock It is only a later shrewd attempt to associate peace, non violence and penance with the Brāhmanic culture that they are called Brāhmanas and Indra is dubbed as a sinner for Brāhmanicide. Vrtra and other non-Āryan adversaries of the Brahmāryan foreign invaders had in their society the Śiśnadevas and Munis who practised peace and penance and hence they were held in high esteem by their followers. These amongst them converted to the Brahmic way took the memories of their erstwhile Gurus into their new fold with force and influence, Brāhmana represented the new equivalent office. These new converts held Indra guilty for Brāhmanicide, or, may be, that when a section of the Irānāryan and Brahmāryan society adopted the Śramanic way; these Brahmas became Asuras The Asuras were a section of the Brahma tribal collective. The Asuras were thus Brahmas also, the Brahmāsuras. When the epithet Asura was transferred to non-Āryans, it was transferred with its Brahmic association. The non-Āryan Vṛtras became not only Asuras but Brahmāsuras. The two different events of history became amalgamated together and this

77. Mahābhārata (Cr Ed.); 5. 9. 42; 12. 272. 36.
78. Mahābhārata (Cr. Ed), 1. 59 32.
79. Mahābhārata (Cr. Ed); 3. 194. 24.
80 Mahābhārata (Cr. Ed); 1. 59. 32
81. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit. (A. I. H. T.); page 307.

coalesced concept was then ceremoniously transferred. The later descendants of the pre-Āryan Śramanic culture in Bhārata; the Buddhists and the Jainas have also been made Daityas and Asuras by the Brāhmanical sages.[82] The association of the Āryan Asuras with Śramaṇic culture had to be obliterated from history by the later separatist Brāhmaṇa Ṛsis and the easiest way discovered by them was to transfer the epithet Asura itself to the people of Śamaṇic culture with whom, according to them, they had eternal conflict. This was the state of affairs till circa 150 B. C., the age of Patañjali.[83] We may thus safely conclude that the Asuras belonged to the Āryan racial stock They were despised by their own kinsmen for their Śramanic associations They were finally ex-communicated from the Brāhmanic society circa 200 A. D. They henceforward began to be identified with the non-Āryan Śramanic peoples ; a clear case of historical transposition

3. THE AṄGIRASAS

Angiras Scientists

The Angirasas were a distinct people within the Āryan fold They were the first Āryan scientists to separate living coal from the mass fires in their original home, the Uttara-kuru-land.[84] They derived their name Aṅgiras from Aṅgārā, a live charcoal.[85] Angāra became Aṅgirasaḥ.[86] The Euro-pāryan (Indo-European) parallel of the word Angārā is "Aṅgirasa" in the sense of messenger. The Greek parallel word "Angalke" also conveys the same sense.[87] Aṅgārā was a messenger of the mass fires to the human society. It carried the message that Agni was of great service for the material development of the human society. The scientific use of

82. F. E. Pargiter; op cit. (A. I. H. T.); page 68, 291.

83. B. N. Puri, India in the time of Patañjali; 1957, page 191, 11.

84. R. C. Jain; The Most Ancient Āryan Society, 1964; Chapter 4 section I.

85. Nirukta, 3 17.

86. Aitareya Brāhmana, 3 34.

87. Siddheswar Varma; op. cit.; page 27.

Agni, thus, originated, for the Āryans, in their undivided social stage.

Angiras and Agni

The Angirasas are sons of Agni.[88] The Aṅgirasas first discovered Agni, hidden in secret, taking refuge from wood to wood. They churned it with great force, hence Agni is called son of strength.[89] The Angirasas, thus, become the fathers of Agni. It appears that the Aṅgirasas carried on two-fold scientific experiments Some attempted to separate a living charcoal from the mass fires. The others churned it from wood. Both the set of scientists were successful. The savage Āryan society benefitted much from the discovery of Agni

The morphotheistic Āryan leaders were in the habit of assuming to themselves the names representing Natural Powers.[90] That Deva scientist-in-chief who led the Angirasas to this discovery assumed to himself the epithet Agni.[91] Angiras, thus, became identified with Agni[92] Agni is Angiras, son of strength[93] Agni is Angiras, augmented with fuel and butter.[94] Agni is Angiras, son of food[95] Agni is chief of Angirasas.[96] Agni is the first, and the chiefest and the eldest of Angirasas.[97] Agni was the chief weapon of the Āryans during their extensive military conquests of Europe and Asia. Agni was a great Āryan military commander who wielded fire and other weapons in battles against the Āryan adversaries. The military importance of commander Agni to the Āryans is next only to Indra in West Asia and Bhārata

88. Ṛgveda 10 5. 2. 5
89. Ṛgveda 5 1. 11 6.
90. R. C Jain, The most Ancient Āryan Society, 1964, Chapter 8.
91. Ṛgveda 1 7. 1. 1.
92. Ṛgveda 1. 1 1. 6; 4. 1. 3. 15; 4. 1. 9 7; 5 1 8. 4, 5. 1. 10. 7; 6. 1. 2 10; 6 2 1 11
93. Ṛgveda 1. 1?. 1. 5; 8. 7. 1. 2
94. Ṛgveda 6. 2. 1. 11, 8. 5. 1. 11, 8 8. 6. 5.
95. Ṛgveda 8. 9 4. 4.
96. Ṛgveda 1. 13. 2. 2; 8 4. 3. 10; 8. 6. 1. 18, 8 6. 2. 8.
97. Ṛgveda 1. 7. 1. 2; 1. 19 1. 1.

Though Agni is the first and the chiefest Aṅgiras; other Āryan Devas soon acquired efficiency in the use of fire and fire weapons Indra, in due course of time, also became chief of the Aṅgirasas.[98] The intelligent Soma also became chief of the Angirasas and sprinkled oblation with exhilarating juice.[99] Indu dropped butter and juice on the Angirasas.[100] The Aṅgirasas were thus associated with the Soma-drinking Āryans. Usas was also an Angiras chief.[101]

Angirasas are very ancient people. They are remembered in the Ṛgveda as father,[102] our father[103] and forefathers.[104] They had Dadhikravan, the swift steed, in front of their chariot.[105] They were great supporters of Indra and praised his deeds.[106] Indra or Viśvedevas bestowed wealth upon the race of Angirasas.[107] Usas bestowed riches upon them.[108]

Military expeditions of Angirasas

The Aṅgirasas were great military warriors. Agni, the chief of Angirasas, consumed Raksasas[109] The greatest military feat of the Angirasas was directed against the Pani leader Vala Angirasas praised Indra.[110] Praised by the Angirasas, Indra broke open the defences in the mountains and destroyed Vala.[111] He forced open all his gates, destroyed cities and

98 Ṛgveda 1 15 7 4; 1 19 4. 3.

99. Ṛgveda 9. 7. 4 6.

100 Ṛgveda 9. 3. 2. 7.

101. Rgveda 7. 5. 5. 1; 7. 5. 9 3

102 Rgveda 10 5. 2. 2.

103 Rgveda 1. 12. 7. 2.

104 Ṛgveda 1 11. 5. 2, 1. 12 7. 2; 4 1. 2. 15; 4. 1. 3. 11; 5 1. 11. 6, 5. 4. 1. 8, 6. 6. 4. 5, 7. 3. 9. 1; 7. 3. 19. 3; 10. 1. 14. 3-6.

105. Ṛgveda 7. 3. 11 4.

106. Ṛgveda 1. 16. 2. 2, 1. 18. 1. 1.

107. Ṛgveda 1. 18. 1. 3.

108. Ṛgveda 4. 5. 6 4.

109. Ṛgveda 8. 6. 1. 27.

110. Ṛgveda 1. 11. 5. 5; 4. 2. 6. 8.

111 Ṛgveda 2. 2. 4. 8.

slew Vala.[112] Indra hurled Vala headlong and liberated cows for Aṅgirasas.[113] Bṛhaspati is son of Angiras and belonged to his gana. It appears that the whole of the military might of the Angiras gana was employed for the destruction of the Vala power. The destruction of the Vala power opened the way for the Angirasas to acquire all the wealth of the Panis comprising horses, cows and other cattle.[115] The second military encounter of the Angirasas was against Aśva. Aṅgirasas obtained the help of Indra and Usas for the demolition of his ancient cities and won cattle.[116] The third military encounter of the Aṅgiras gana leader Brhaspati was with Parvata. Brhaspati under the leadership of Indra, set free the herd of kine concealed by Parvata[117] In the fourth encounter, Angirasas themselves preceded Āświns to the cavern and recovered the cattle.[118] It appears that their adversaries fled and did not throw any opposition Indra assisted Aṅgirasas in opening the herd of cattle.[119] So did Soma.[120] Indra and Aṅgirasas, with the help of Saramā, set on the search of cattle[121] of the Panis and plundered them. The Angirasas, with the help of their compatriots, undertook these military and pillaging activities for winning the wealth and riches of their adversaries.

Aṅgirasas as Asura Warriors

The Aṅgirasas were great Asura warriors.[122] It appears that when the Irānāryan society became divided in Surā-drinking and non-Surā-drinking sections, led respectively by

112. Ṛgveda 6. 2. 3. 5, 2. 1 11 20.
113. Ṛgveda 8. 3. 2. 8; 8. 7 4. 3.
114. Ṛgveda 4. 5. 5. 5.
115. Ṛgveda 1. 13. 10. 4.
116. Ṛgveda 2. 2. 9. 5.
117. Ṛgveda 2. 3. 1. 18.
118. Ṛgveda 1. 16. 7. 18.
119. Ṛgveda 1. 10. 1. 3; 1. 19. 6. 4
120. Ṛgveda 9. 5. 1. 23.
121. Ṛgveda 1. 11. 5. 3.
122. Ṛgveda 3. 4. 15. 7.

Indra and Varuṇa; the Aṅgirasas sided the former. They afterwards maintained their supreme position in the military hierarchy of the Brahmāryan section under the supreme commandership of Indra. They were reckoned only next to Indra. Asura Angirasas played significant historic role in Brahmāryan victories over Vṛtras, Dāsas, Dasyus and Paṇis in far western and western Bhārata The efficient fire-wielding commanders, the Angirasas, owe an explanation to the history of mankind for ruthless, inhuman and barbarous burning of important ancient cities in these regions. The archaeological explorations in these regions supply evidence of burning at the end of the Rana Ghundari III c phase. The Sohar-Damb settlement at Nal was so violently burnt that its name Sohar-Damb meaning "burnt red" still persists for more than three millenniums and stands testimony to the Brahmāryan brutality and savagery. At Dabarkot, the upper feet of the tell showed no less than four-thick ash layers, implying repeated destructive conflagrations of the later settlements. One of the later settlements at this site was that of Harappa people.[123] Asura Indra could not have accomplished these great military feats without the active participation of his efficient Angiras scientists. Asura Angirasas, the great military commanders of the Brahmāryan Fire-Brigade, played a decisive role in subjugating these regions

Beginning of Retualisation of Yajña

The Brahmāryan final victory in Dāśarājña war circa 1100 B. C securely established their political power in Bhārata. The Angirasas, who played a very important historical role in undivided Āryan and Irānāryan times, maintained their supremacy in the Brahmic hierarchy in the post Dāśarājña period. They rendered yeomen service in cementing the Brahmāryan foundations in Bhārata. Yajña, as previously, still was their great weapon. They were the masters of the original Yajña. They, in the changed circumstances, continued to be the masters of the ritualised Yajña. The moety of the Viśvāmitras, under the Bhṛgu influence, had joined the

123. S. Piggot; Pre-historic India; 1950; pages 123, 126.

Brahmāryan fold. They soon recognised the importance of the Angirasas in the Brahma society and developed friendship with them. The Aṅgirasas also appreciated the historical significance of the powerful Viśvāmitras in furthering their political and social supremacy in Bhārata. Viśvāmitras, along with other Bhāratiya convert Ṛṣis, helped the Brahma Ṛṣis in the ritualisation of the Yajña The institution of Yajña was ritualised within the Brahma framework. The ritualised pattern of Yajña, as finally evolved under the leadership of the Angirasas, had the final stamp of the Aṅgiras way. Every Ṛṣi and worshipper, thenceforward, performed Yajñas in the Angiras way. Viśvāmitras were the first to popularise this Aṅgiras way of Yajña Viśvāmitra worshipped like an Aṅgiras [124] Aṅgirasas, priests at the magico-ritualities bestowed great riches upon Visvāmītra at the magico-rituality [125] The non-Āryan convert Ṛsi Bharadvāja became the most earnest adorer amongst Angirasas. [126] The adorer of Maruts praised like Angiras. [127] The new convert Rsi Nābhāka addressed new prayers as by Angiras [128] The vast mass of the adorers adored Agni like Angirasas. [129] The Brahmāryan society was still a universal tribal collective, the Brahman The Brahma Rsis; like Angirasas, Vasisthas and others, and the convert Brahma Ṛṣis like Viśvāmitra, Bharadvāja, Kanva, Kaśyapa and others, jointly evolved the institution of the ritualised Yajña, under the leadership of Angirasas Devas gave to the Angirasas the milch cow which Aryaman milked for Agni [130] for the advancement of Agni, i.e. Yajña. We, thus, find that the Angirasas played a very great historical role from the very beginning. They are significantly associated with the Āryan

124. Ṛgveda 3. 3. 2. 19.
125. Ṛgveda 3. 4. 15. 7.
126. Ṛgveda 6. 1 11. 3
127. Ṛgveda 6. 4. 6. 11.
128. Ṛgveda 8. 5. 10. 12.
129. Ṛgveda 1. 7. 1. 17; 1. 9. 2 3; 1. 11. 5. 1; 1. 13. 5. 3, 2. 2. 6. 1; 8. 6. 1. 13.
130. Ṛgveda 1. 20. 6. 7.

progress in Europe and Asia through all the stages till the beginning of the first millennium B. C.

4. THE ATHARVANS

Irānāryan People

The Atharvans are a lesser people than the Aṅgirasas. They are also lesser criminals in history than the Angirasas. The Atharvaveda is known as Atharvāngiras Veda. The Atharvans are, here, the priests of white magic while the Angirasas of black magic. The Atharvans are Irānāryan people. The Atharvans are known to the Avestic literature. They are associated with Agni [131]

The Atharvans are nowhere associated with Soma or Surā It appears that when the Irānāryan society was divided into the two-sections of Surā-drinkers and non-Surā-drinkers; the Atharvan joined the non-Surā-drinking Varuna people. Hence, they enjoy more prestige in the Avestic literature than the Angirasas Indra for this very reason entertained hostility towards them. Indra admits that he slew Ātharvan Dadhyañch, son of Atharvan. [132]

Agni People

The Atharvanas are fathers like the Angirasas and the Bhṛgus.[133] They generated Agni. [134] The Agni generated by Atharvan is the messenger of Vivaśvān. Vivaśvān in this context, appears to be a human votary, a follower of Atharvan. He could have been an Atharvana Ṛṣi. The "messengership" of Agni begins in the post-Dāśarājña war ritualistic age. Atharvan, first by Yagñas discovered the path and then the Sūrya was born. [135] Vivaśvān and Śūrya both have the same meaning and hence may be identified. Vivaśvān is known to the Avestic literature [136] but not Manu. After the

131. Ṛgveda 7. 1. 1. 1
132. Ṛgveda 10. 3. 17. 2.
133. Ṛgveda 10. 1. 14. 6.
134. Ṛgveda 6. 2. 1. 13.
135. Ṛgveda 1. 13. 10. 5.
136. A. F. Khabardar; op. cit.; page 364.

Dāśarājña war, it appears, that the Atharvans made peace with them and along with Manu and Dadhyañch engaged in making hymns in praise of Indra [137]

Atharvan-Vivasvān Manu

Atharvan, in Avestic literature, has been identified with prophet Zarthuṣṭhra himself. Atharvan, thus, becomes deeply associated with Ahura Mazdā. Vivaśvān is father of Yima or Yama [139] Tvaṣṭr is mentioned there but not as father-in-law of Vivasvān but as Ahura Mazdā himself, the motion giver. [140] Ahura Mazdā and his messenger Zarthuṣṭhra were against animal sacrifices and soma-drinking. Manu is not at all mentioned in the Avestic literature. Atharvan and Yama are the only connecting links Atharvan, in the Vedic literature is father of Vivaśvān Atharvan Agni is his messenger [141] Yama is real brother of Manu. [142] Manu, in the Rgveda is Vivaśvān himself [143] But he is better known as son of Vivaśvat or Vivaśvant [144] Vivaśvat married Saranyu alias Savarṇā. [145] Manu, after her, is also called Sāvarni, a matriarchal epithet Saranyu or Savarnā was daughter of Tvaṣṭr She was also the mother of Yama. [146] It appears that Vivaśvant married the daughter of Tvaṣṭr in the Irānāryan age and only Yama was born to her. Manu is only a Brahmāryan leader. It may, hence, fairly be assumed that Manu was, not the son, only a descendant of Vivaśvant. He was associated with Yama very late in the Tenth Maṇḍala of

137. Ṛgveda 1. 13. 7. 16.

138. A. F. Khabardar, op. cit., page 285

139. A. F. Khabardar, op. cit.; page 363.

140. A. F. Khabardar, op. cit, pages 182–183.

141. Ṛgveda 8. 2. 4. 7.

142. Ṛgveda 10. 1. 10.

143. Ṛgveda 8 Balakhilya 4. 1.

144. (1) Atharvaveda 8. 10. 24.
(2) Śatapatha Brāhmana; 13. 4. 3. 3.
(3) Mahābhārata (Cr. Ed.), 1. 10. 11.

145. Nirukta; 12. 10.

146. Ṛgveda 10. 2. 1. 1–2.

the Ṛgveda. Tvaṣṭṛ was father of pre-Āryan non-Āryan Ahi Vṛtra.[147] Ahi Vṛtra was the arch-enemy of the Irānāryan foreign invaders in Far Western Bhārata who was killed not by Indra but by Varuna who himself and his followers were later conquered by the Vṛtra culture. Irānāryan (Indo-Irānian) Indra is not Vṛtrahan.[148] Tvaṣṭṛ, father of horned Vṛtra,[149] is three-horned. Horn was the emblem of power and prestige with the non-Āryan dignitaries. Tvaṣṭṛ is considered an Asura by Sāyana[151] as late as fourteenth century A D Vivasvant or Tvaṣṭṛ have been described, as sons of Kaśyapa, the father of the Ahi or Nāga sub-race. Tvaṣṭṛ appears as independantly associated with the Ahi sub-race. Manu, on the maternal side, if not on the paternal side, is associated with the pre-Āryan non-Āryan Ahi blood.

Ātharvana Manu-prophet of Yajña Ritualisation

Ātharvana Manu, a descendant of Vivasvat is the first magico-ritualist.[152] He is the inventor of magico-ritual rites.[153] Angiras alone has been given in the Ṛgveda the fatherhood of Yajña. What, then, is the significance of Manu, Agni, being the father of Yajña. Angiras was the originator of the Yajña, the tribal activity of the undivided Āryans.[154] When the institution of Yajña began to be ritualised during the post-Dāśarājña period, it still remained associated with the human Yajña. The convert Brahma Ṛṣis had taken with them the ideology of non-violence into their new fold. That ideology sharply reacted upon rituals associated with violence in

147. Mahābhārata (Cr. Ed.); 5. 9. 43.

148. B. K. Ghose; Indo-Iranian Relations (in Vedic Age); 1957; page 222.

149. Ṛgveda 1. 7. 3. 12.

150. Ṛgveda 5. 3. 11. 13.

151. Ṛgveda Saṁhitā (V. S. M.); Vol. I page 578 (Rv. 1. 14. 9. 4); Vol IV page 218 (Rv. 6. 5. 12. 3.), Vol. II page 414 (Rv. 3. 4. 10. 4.)

152. Ṛgveda 10. 5. 3. 7.

153. G. Bühler, The Laws of Manu; 1886; page LIX.

154. R. C. Jain; The Most Ancient Āryan Society; 1964; Chapter IV. section I.

the then Yajñas. The new doctrines with the passage of time gained wide acceptance. Viśvāmitra saved Śunahaśepa from ritualistic death [155] Manu originated the new form of Yajña along with seven Purohitas. The seven Purohitas included Viśvāmitra, Kaśyapa, Atri and Gotama also Manu became the father of Yajña ritualisation in the newer form without human oblations though; under the influence of Indra and old Brahma Rsis animal sacrifices and Soma-drinking continued even at these reformed Yajñas. Manu was a departure from old Angiras way of Yajña. The later Yajñas followed the Manu way of Yajña ritualisation. [156] Manu perfected the art and science of ritualisation of the institution of Yajña. Yajña, in the Manu form, became divorced from the old Brahmic (tribal) activity though its Brahmic foundation was kept in tact. Ritualisation of the institution of Yajña, was the effect of the spiritual reaction due to the strong impact of the original Śramanic culture. Yajña in the olden days, signified the tribal activity of violence and exploitation in its brutal way. The primitive Āryan society had developed the social institution of Purusamedha with tribal dances and promiscuous matings. The Ganapati himself willed his death This volition was not ego-centred but a collective impersonal volition The tribal collective willed the death of its supreme leader and he voluntarily sacrificed himself Purusamedha was performed on the occasions of grave "national" emergencies either when some enemy gana was to be conquered or the tribal collective had to defend itself from some foreign invasion. The eating of the flesh, blood and bones by the tribal collective was either the Federation-Feast or the Unification-feast. The ultimate aim was to establish or strengthen the oneness of the original or the augmented tribe. Convert Brahma ṛsi Viśvāmitra, the former Dasyu chief, joining the Brahmāryan fold with his fifty younger sons led by Madhucchandas, had given death blow to the Puruṣamedha. The ritualisation era of Yajña had been inaugurated and Purusa was ritualised into Horse. It was a great revolution in the

155. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa; 7. 13–18.

156. Ṛgveda 1. 13. 3. 5.

history of Yajña. Aśvamedha took the place of Puruṣamedha. Taittirīya Brāhmana manifestly narrates the purpose of Aśvamedha like this [157]

"After he (Prajāpati) had created the creatures, Prajāpati through love entered into them. He could not disengage himself from them and re-assemble his parts together. He said, "He shall prosper who shall disengage me from these and restore me to unity." Then they prospered. Whosoever offers the Aśvamedha, he restores Prajāpati to unity and (consequently) prospers." The sacrifice of Prajāpati is known only to the Tenth Maṇḍala of the Ṛgveda. The conception of Ganapati, now, in the changed circumstances, had been transferred to Prajāpati Ganapati was transformed as Prajāpati. Ganapati (Purusa) or Prajāpati represents the whole will of the tribal collectivity. Horse, now, was identified with Ganapati or Prajāpati Horse, hence, came to represent the whole will of the tribal collectivity. All had to be sacrificed to activise the whole The Horse could be arrested by somebody at the cost of military engagement with the whole society, the horse represented Aśvamedha was the latest invention of the Brāhmanic society to keep its homogeneity and unity in tact and to further increase its strength and power. Janamejaya, called son of Pariksit, in the post-Rgvedic period circa the ninth century B. C, performed a great Aśvamedha.[158] Aśvamedha ritualisation appears to have gained supremacy in the first two centuries of the first millennium B. C The ritualisation of Yajña placed the Brahmic social exploitation on a human basis and in a rational form. The violence associated with Puruṣamedha became very much diminished though the horrers of animal sacrifices still continued. Social changes do not come in a day The Aśvamedha, still, was a great advance on the Puruṣamedha. The Aṅgiras way of Yajña had given way to the Manu way of Yajña. Manu was the prophet of this great social revolution in

157. Tattirīya Brāhmana 3 9. 8

158 (1) Aitareya Brāhmana 8. 2. 1

(2) H. C. Roychowdhari; Political History of Ancient India, 1950; pages 36-37.

the history of Yajña, Manu, hence, may rightly be called the father of Yajña ritualisation.

Age of Manu

The Āryan Ganapatis, Devas and Ṛṣis all took active part in military combats with their adversaries. The Aṅgirasas, Vasiṣṭhas and Bhṛgus, along with Indra, Bṛhaspati, Maruts and others, had played glorious roles against Vṛtras, Paṇis and others of their stock. We do not find Manu taking part, actively or construtively, in any military combat. This is very significant. Manu appears in the Ṛgveda along with Angiras and Yayāti, [159] Bhrgu and Angiras, [160] Atharvan and Dadhyañch [161] and Dadhyañch, Angiras, Atri and Kanva;[162] the old and the new Brahma Rsis But he himself is not an old Rsi No Brahmāryan leader reamined aloof from military activites before Dāśarājña war. Manu, hence, may be placed in the post-Dāśaṛājña period. Manu had Uśanas Kāvya as his Guru. Uśanas, son of Kavi, established Agni as the ministrant priest, as the offerer of magico-rituality for Manu [163] Uśanas Kāvya may be identified with Uśanas-Śukra belonging to the Bhrgu tribe Uśanas Kāvya was the preceptor of Daityas and Dānavas. [164] Bhṛgus, though originally pure Āryans, had become a mixed tribe They had fought along with the Dasyus and the Dāsas against Sudās in the Dāśarājña battle at Paruṣṇī. [165] Uśanas-Kāvya could have imparted the learning of the Yajña rituals to Manu only after the Dāśa-rājña war when the victors and the vanquished had amalgamated. Manu perfected the art of Yajña ritualisation with scientific expertness and won many followers who began to be called followers or sons of Manu. [166] He could not yet

159. Ṛgveda 1. 7. 1. 17.

160. Ṛgveda 8 6 1. 13.

161. Ṛgveda 1. 13. 7. 16.

162. Ṛgveda 1. 20 6. 9.

163. Ṛgveda 8. 4. 3. 17.

164. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit (A I H T.) page 18, 194

165. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1. 6.

166. Ṛgveda 4. 4. 5 1

win the title of fatherhood of all the ritual priests in the kernal of the Ṛgveda. He himself is still a minor ṛṣi contributing only an insignificant part in the making of the Ṛgvedic hymns. He is called the progenitor of Yajña ritualisation only in the Tenth Maṇḍala of the Ṛgveda composed and added to the kernal of the Ṛgveda circa 800 B.C. We may, thus confidently place the Manu way of Yajña ritualisation between circa 1000–800 B. C.

5. THE VASIṢṬHAS

Vasiṣṭhas of Tṛtsu Tribe

Vasiṣṭha was born of the common seminal effusion of Mitra and Varuna from the womb (Water-jar) of Urvasī, the fairest of the Āryan Apsarasas. [167] Vasiṣṭha belonged to the race of white-complexioned people. [168] Vasiṣṭha, thus, belongs to the pure Āryan racial stock. He was very popular amongst his own people He did not overlook even the very lowest amongst his own people [169] Vasiṣṭha and his descendants were Tṛtsus [170] Divodāsa, grandfather of Sudās, was a commonder who rose to the status of Indra. Sudās became senior of Indra. [171] It appears that Divodāsa was the founder of the Tṛtsu tribe which attained great power and prestige during the times of Sudās. Vasiṣṭha rose to great eminence in the Tṛtsu tribe. He was Vasiṣṭha; [172] eminent, creator and the first; amongst his Tṛtsu people. He became the Pura-etā or Purohita [173] of the Tṛtsus The Tṛtsu people, thenceforward, greatly prospered [174]

Vasiṣṭha and Dāśarājña War

Vasiṣṭha was on a great masterplan for the strength and glory of his people He sought the help of Indra, who, at

167 Ṛgveda 7 2 16. 11. 13.

168. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 16. 1

169. Ṛgveda 7 4. 4. 3

170. Ṛgveda 7. 5. 13. 8.

171. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1. 16.

172. Ṛgveda 2. 1. 9. 1; 2 4. 4. 1; 9. 1 2. 3.

173. Ṛgveda Saṁhitā (V. S. M.), Vol. III, page 350.

174 Ṛgveda 7. 2. 16. 6.

the instance of Pāśadymna Vāyata, was helping the Pṛthus and Parśus [175] in Far Western Bhārata. Indra understood Vasiṣṭha and hastened to the help of Tṛtsus. [176] Sudās had to encounter a minor opposition on the river Sindhu, but he, through the help of Indra and Vasiṣṭhas, easily slew his foes. [177] Sudās and his Tṛtsus encamped between Sindhu and Paruṣṇī. The famous Dāśarājña war [178] between the Brahmāryan-Bhāratīya forces was then fought Sudās through the help of Indra and Vasiṣṭhas, won the Dāśarājña war; annihilated the Bharatas and conquered their vast country [179]

Vasistha-Viśvāmitra Rivalry

Viśvāmitra led the Bharata forces of Dāśarājña confederacy and took his forces from east to west crossing the joint stream of Vipās and Śutudrī [180] The Sudās forces had come from west to east. Both the opposing forces first met at Hariyupīya. [181] Several scholas consider that Sudās was the leader of the Bharatas and his forces crossed from east to west in the Dāśarājña war This is manifestly wrong. The Bnaratas were quite different from the Tṛtsus A wrong and mechnical interpretation of certain Ṛgvedic hymns have led the scholars to such fallacious results. The Dāśarājña war sūkta clearly gives the right directions Vasiṣṭha of the west and Viśvāmitra of the east stood face to face against each other in the first fateful war fought on the present Bhāratīya soil that for the next three thousands years or more led to the chain of foreign invasions leading consequently to peoples enslavements, time and again The rivalry between Vasistha and Viśvāmitra is

175. Macdonell & Keith, Vedic Index, 1958, Vol I, page 523 Ludwig sees in Pāśadyumna Vāyata a priest of the Pṛthus and Parśus. This view is very probable

176. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 16. 2

177. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 16. 3

178. Ṛgveda 3 3 4, 7 2. 16, 7 5. 13, 7. 2. 1; 6 3. 4. Dāśarājña War is mainly described in these Ṛgvedic Sūktas.

179. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 16. 5. 6.

180. Ṛgveda 3. 3. 4. 11-12.

181. Ṛgveda 6. 3. 4. 5. 6.

very true and this historical rivalry has rightly been referred in the later Brāhmaṇical literature. Only its true, historical significance had never been rightly appreciated. Viśvāmitra has been described as a Kṣatriya prince who practised great penances and austerities to win Brahma-hood. Vasiṣṭhas always opposed his getting the Brahmahood. This Brāhmaṇic and Purāṇic legend contains in itself a great historical truth. He has been denounced as a Kṣatriya because he belonged to the pre-Āryan non-Āryan racial stock. The Brahma, at this period of Brahmāryan history, was an undivided universal tribal collective of the foreign invaders; having no Kṣatriya class at this stage Though the Vasiṣṭhas opposed the move of the admittance of the Viśvāmitras to the Brahma fold; Bhṛgus, the earstwhile enemies of Vasiṣṭha and Tṛtsus; along with the Angirasas, supported the move and Viśvāmitra and his fifty younger sons led by Madhuchchhandas, who contributed much to the creations of the Ṛgvedic hymns, were converted to the Brahma way. Viśvāmitra and his sons, along with the older Brahma ṛṣis, became the first convert Brahma ṛṣis. They did not primarily belong to the Brahma fold. They adopted it. These black-skinned convert Brahmas were cleverer, wiser and more intelligent than the white-skinned ones.[182] The Vasiṣṭhas opposed the conversion of the Bhāratiya people because they were superior to them.[183] They also feared the loss of monopoly to tribal wealth and riches which was exclusively preserved for them. The fears of Vasiṣṭha proved true. Viśvāmitra won Purohita-ship of Sudās.[184] Vasiṣṭha overcame the sons of Sudās in revenge for the slaying of his sons.[185] Material loss could not be left unrevenged. The Viśvāmitras, inspite of the Vasiṣṭhas and in face of their active opposition, grew more in their adopted society.

---

182. Buddhaprakash; Vṛtra, A B. O. R. I Vol. 30, page 194.

183. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa; 12. 6. 1. 41

184. (1) Nirukta; 2. 24.

(2) Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra; 26. 12. 13.

185. Macdonell & Keith; Vedic Index; 1958, Vol. II page 275.

Pañchāgnis

The Vasiṣṭhas were great sacrificers. They were the first to profit by the spoils of war won in the Dāśarājña war and from the later chain of exploitations of the original people. They glorified Indra, [186], Varuna, [187] Agni [188] who art also Mitra and Varuna,[189] Uṣas,[190] Indra and Vāyu,[191] Aśvins [192] and Heaven and Earth.[193] The Vasiṣṭhas settled on the banks of river Saraswatī and established Vasiṣṭha Agni.[194] The Vasiṣṭhas, on the banks of auspicious Saraswatī, set open the two doors, (the east and the west) of sacrifice. [195] It appears that Vasiṣṭhas, the conservative non-progressive people, evolved two forms of sacrifices; one for the pure Brahmas and the other for the convert Brahmas as generally happens in history. History has witnessed such social and religious differences between the Muslims and their converts and the Christians *and their converts. Vasiṣṭha may be credited with the father*hood of the historical differential treatments It appears that in opposition to Vasiṣṭha Agni, Bhārata Agni [196] was invented by the convert Brahmas. We also know the most ancient Aṅgiras Agni. Aṅgiras Agni, as shown earlier, was invented from the separation of Aṅgāra from the mass fires. Vasiṣṭha Agni is the Trtsu edition of Aṅgiras Agni. Bhārata Agni was generated with ten fingers by Devaśravas and Devavāta, sons of Bharata on the excellent banks of the Dṛṣadvatī; Āpayā and Saraswatī. [197] Bhārata Agni displays a human aspect being associated with ten fingers. It is not a Deva

186. Rgveda 7. 2. 6. 1; 7. 3. 4 4; 7. 2. 6. 6
187. Ṛgveda 7. 5. 16. 5.
188. Rgveda 7. 3. 9 6, 7. 1. 7. 7, 7. 1 8. 7.
189. Ṛgveda 7. 1 12. 3.
190. Ṛgveda 7. 5. 10. 1.
191. Ṛgveda 7. 6. 1. 7; 7. 6 2. 7.
192. Ṛgveda 1. 16. 7. 9; 7. 4. 15. 6.
193. Ṛgveda 7. 3. 6 7; 7. 3. 7 7.
194. Ṛgveda 7. 1 1. 8.
195. Ṛgveda 7. 6. 6. 6.
196. Ṛgveda 2. 1. 7. 1. 5; 4 3. 4. 4; 6. 2. 1. 19.
197. Ṛgveda 3. 2. 11. 2–4.

Agni but it is a human Agni. It is significant that this reference occurs in the third Maṇḍala of the Ṛgveda composed by a convert Brahma Ṛṣi. Bhārata Agni may, therefore, well mean Viśvāmitra Agni. We have already alluded to the Atharvan Agni and the Bhṛgu Agni. All these Pañchāgnis merged and developed into Manu Agni which, thenceforward, became the universal pattern for all the Brahma followers all alike.

CHAPTER VIII

TWO EARLIEST MIXED TRIBES

1. INTRODUCTION

Purity of blood is a myth since eternity. We may tentatively speak of this or that blood but that is indicative only of certain groups, territorial or social The fusion of cultures, civilizations, ideas and ways along with their bearers is a historical truth. Hindu society is the mixture of the Āryan and the Pre-Āryan bloods. The admission of the existence of Hindu society presupposes a proto-Hindu society divided into the Bhāratīyan and the Brāhmanic societies. Hindu society was the result of the fusion of the two societies. There were mixtures in the two aforesaid societies since their contacts in the later part of the second millennium B C. Their earliest contacts were primarily on the battlefields. But when the sounds of the war-drums receded, both settled down to peace and mixed together. This mixing was a two-way traffic, joined by manifold streams.

We today witness thousands of mixed castes in India. But inspite of our casteic diversities into the Brāhmanas, the Kṣatriyas, the Vaiśyas and the Śūdras and their unaccountable and unaccounted divisions, we are all one. We do not differ. This is an ever-going phenomenon of Indian history. Our earliest mixtures may be traced to the dawn of the Ṛgvedic history 3000 years ago. History records the two earliest ethnic mixtures which became the fore-runners of the later mixtures. The earliest mixture of the Brahmāryan and the Bhāratīya blood resulted in the origin of the Bhṛgu ethnic group with the former elements predominating. The second earliest mixture of these two resulted in the origin of the Kuru ethnic group with the later elements pre-dominating. We discuss the origin of these two mixed ethnic groups in the following sections.

2. THE BHṚGUS

Archaeology and the Ṛgveda

D. H. Gordon, a sympathetic archaeologist who also draws upon the literary sources to find out truth, has made very pertinent remarks in establishing some relationship between archaeology and the Rgveda as follows—

"These invasions appear to have been the result of the movements of warlike people exemplified by those of Giyan II and Hissar III Such movements and in fact the general unrest at the start of the second millennium B. C. which spread throughout all the countries south of the Caucasus from Anatolia to Elam, must be associated with the appearance of the Āryans upon the historical scene . . The hymns of the Rgveda indicate that some of the invaders came to terms with the Harappans . It seems likely also that these Āryans or semi-Āryan tribes of Turvaśa, Vṛchivants and Yadus, who were located in the south-west and called Dāsa in one passage of the Ṛgveda (Rv. 10. 62. 10) and who are referred to as having been brought by Indra from across the sea (Samudra = Indus ?), were descendants of the Jhukar people. They fought the true Vedic clans of the Tṛtsu Śrñjaya from the time of the battle of Hariyūpīya, which may well indicate Harappa to the decisive battle many years later when the confederacy of Ten Kings, an alliance of all the western clans under the leadership of the Yadus and the Turvaśas, was beaten by the Trtsu and the Śrñjaya under Sudās." [1] He commends the original research of Stuart Piggot who traced the connections of the Shahi Tump grava-goods with Hissar III, Anau III and Jhukar and indicated that Circa 1800 B. C. is a reasonable date to start period of invasion.[2] He has repeated some of his arguments in a more important late work of his. [3]

1. D. H. Gordon—The Pottery Industries of the Indo-Iranian Border, Ancient India No. 10–11, page 170.
2. D. H. Gordon, op. cit, page 168.
3. D. H. Gordon, The Pre-Historic Back groud of Indian Culture, Bombay, 1958, pages 77 to 97.

D. H. Gordon includes the disintegration of the Harappa culture during the period of invasions. He suggests the resistance of Harappan people to invaders Circa 1700–1650 B. C. and the fall of Mohenjodaro Circa 1550 B. C. thus slightly amending the chronology of Mortimer Wheeler from Circa 2500–1500 B. C. to Circa 2600–1550 B. C. [4]

Stuart Piggot parallels one ornamented stone bead from Lohunjodaro to one found at Hissar III c and Anau III. He also maintains that Shahi Tump cemetery, which is pretty well dated, is contemporary with the end of the Harappa culture in the Indus Valley. [5] Mackay excavated seven bronze or copper pins and suggested that they are in the nature of a Harappa survival into the Jhukar period. Stuart Piggot, disagreeing with him, maintains that they are the type of the Jhukar culture, and in no way associated with that of Harappa. He accords it chronological position of Hissar III and Anau III. Wheeler finds fallacy in equating objects in date on the basis of level. [6]

Āryans in West Asia

Piggot and Gordon agree that the great Āryan movements began from Russian Turkistan Circa 2000 B. C. [7] The first division of the Āryans had taken place before this period and the Europāryan brother might have migrated to Europe south of Urals from their undivided home, the northern parts of the South Russian Steppes, which part in Bhāratīya mythico-geography may be called Uttarakuru. [8] The remaining Asiāryans migrated South of Caucasus to Anatolia and Northern Mesopotamia and South of Pamirs to Iran Circa 2000 B. C. Those Asiāryans who went to Anatolia founded

4. D. H. Gordon, op. cit., Ancient India, pages 165, 170, 178.
5. Stuart Piggot, Pre-historic India, Pelican, 1952, pages 225, 114.
6. Mortimer Wheeler-Technical Section, Ancient India, No. 3 pages 145 to 147.
7. Stuart Piggot, op. cit., page 240. D. H. Gordon, op. cit., (P. B. I. C.) p. 87.
8. R. C. Jain, The Most Ancient Āryan Society; 1964, Chapter II.

the Hittite Power.[9] Those who went to northern Mesopotamia came to be known as the Hurrians in history. They founded their powers at Alepo, Mukishe and other sites chief of which was the Mittani power. They joined into Hurri confederacy with Mittani at their head.[10] The capital of the Mittanis was at Wassukani which still remains unidentified.[11] Those Āryans who crossed the Parmirs to Iran had to wage hardest battles with the local inhabitants and their early history still remains obscure. Hammurabi was a great king who ruled Babylonia Circa 1700 B. C.[12] who defeated Rimsin, the Elamite King of Larsa.[13] By the time the Irānāryans had gained supremacy in north and west Iran; Great Hammurabi's dynasty came to an end about 1530 B. C. in Babylonia and she entered a long period of decadence during which power went in the hands of Kassites, the occupants of nearby Iranian mountains. These Irānāryan Kassites took over power in Babylonia about 1500 B. C. and remained there for nearly 400 years.[14] They used the word "Surias" to designate the sun.[15] The Historians generally assign the date Circa 1750 B. C. to Kassites in establishing their power in Babylonia. Then we may travel back by 200 years and understand the above chronology in this light.

It appears that these semi-cultured, nomadic, barbarous Asiāryans had trifurcated from southern Russia according to a plan. These catalysts of history set up three independent states in western Asia but never fought amongst themselves till they consolidated their power in the middle of the second

9. B. K. Ghose—The Āryan Problem in Vedic Age, 1957, page 206.

10. Leonard Woolley—A Forgotten Kingdom, Pelican, 1953, pages 122, 131.

11. Sabatino Moscati—The Face of the Ancient Orient; 1960; p. 189.

12. S. Moscati, op. cit , page 63.

13. Percy Sykes—A History of Persia, 1958, page 77.

14. S. Moscati, op. cit., pages 64, 154.
S. Piggot, op. cit., page 260 (He gives Circa 1600 B. C.)

15. B. K. Ghose, op. cit., page 205.

millennium B. C. (About 1500 B. C.)[16] They took five centuries to consolidate their rule. The Asiāryans in Iran, who may be called the Irānāryans were the latest in establishing their state. It may be due to three reasons. Firstly that the original inhabitants were better organised; secondly, that their culture was far superior to the culture of the original inhabitants whom the Hittites and the Hurrians had to deal with; thridly, that Babylonia possessed only a little lesser quantum of culture than the Iranians but had a better political and military organisation.

All these people of the mountain, as these Asiāryans were called, had formed only the upper ruling classes of the population, the major base remaining indigenous. The Hittite upper classes, the Hurrian noble classes and the Kassite leaders had brought with them their language and their divinities but they could not thrust them on the original inhabitants; rather they succumbed to their superior language and culture Despite its political decadence, Mesopotamia in the age of the peoples of the mountains celebrates the triumph of its culture,[17] effecting the Asiāryans of the west and the east. The Irānāryans of the east were largely 'converted' to the superior original Śramanic culture.

Internecine Āryan Conflicts

After the consolidation of power in the above mentioned three States, the greed and ambition of these States came in conflict with each other. Though we little find the Kassites in military involvements, the Hittites and the Mittaneies (leader of the Hurrian confederacy) came in conflict more often till the latter finally accepted the overlordship of the former as is evidenced by the record of Boghaz-Keiu treaty concluded between Hittie King Suppiluliumus and the Mittani King Mattiwaja son of Dusharatta or Tusharatta in 1400 B. C. or 1380 B. C. or 1365 B. C.[18] This treaty mentions the Āryan

16. S. Moscati, op. cit., page 153-154.
17. S. Moscati, op. cit., page 156.
18. B. K. Ghose, op. cit., page 204.
S. Piggot, op. cit., page 250.
S. Moscati, op. cit., page 190.

leaders Varuna, Mitra, Indra and Nāsatyas along-with Babylonian Ishtar, which clearly shows that the Asiāryans including the Irānāryans were still an undifferentiated people.[19] The Irānāryans in Anatolia, Babylonia and Iran were adopting the superior culture of the land but a portion of Asiāryan society did not reconcile with this state of affairs and gave the former tough opposition. Boghaz Keui treaty accelerated the process and the differences became acute. Till now Varuṇa enjoyed more power and prestige than Indra, the leader of the oppositionists. After this time, a permanent schism occurred in the undivided Irānāryans and Indra-led Āryans (the Brahmāryans) planned to advance towards the much famous east, the land of peace and plenty. The Brahmāryans after the schism, advanced towards the east through two routes, one through Arachosia and the other through Gedrosia. Piggot refers to the times of troubles, of insecurity and raiding, arson and pillaging in north Baluchistan (Arachosia), in Rana Ghundai where we witness repeated destructions. The last phase of Zhob-ware settlement at Nal was so much burnt down that the Tell is still called Sohr Dumb, the Red Mound, from its fire-reddened soil. At Dabarkot, the upper 6 feet of the Tell, exposed in section, showed no less than four thick ash layers, implying repeated destructive conflagarations of the later settlements and here occurred abundant fragments of the encrusted ware of Rana Ghundai V Type on the surface. Piggot gives this period as about 1400 or 1350 B. C. in his chronological table II. [20] He gives the same period to the destruction of Harappa as he gives to Rana Ghundai III and to Mohenjodaro little later from which D. H. Gordon has arrived at his chronology.

It appears that Indra-led Brahmāryans bi-furcated to the East somewhere from the Elamite mountains. They must have drawn their land forces from northern Mesopotamia and northern Iran. The southern wing must have included some expert mariners and good navigators as the Brahmāryans of the Gedrosian wing had waged one or more naval battles also.

19. B. K. Ghose, Indo-Iranian relations, op. cit., page 220.
20. S. Piggot, op. cit., page 215, 242.

The Aurvas

During this period, Circa 1400 B. C., Babylonia was governed by the Kassite King, Kuri-galzu II who was an impassioned builder.[21] Kassite Kingdom was enjoying a great era of peace and prosperity and she had no battles to win. A great call from the 'mountains of Elam' was roaring in west Asian sky. The great navigators of the port-city of Ur, who had no martial activities to perform at home and were the beneficiaries of the lucrative trade with Bhārata joined these Brahmāryan forces probably with the blessings of the Kassite ruler. These people owned a good navy and had sufficient experiences of naval warfare and the oceans. The inhabitants of the port city of Ur, the Aurvas played a very important part in this military expedition. The Kassite Aurvas had learnt the art of metallurgy from the former inhabitants of Ur who were taught the art of metallurgy alongwith the art of writing and agriculture by one Oannes [22] who alongwith his comrades had earlier colonised the land of Sumer. They were very efficient in the technical know-how of the use of fire since their journey from south Russia. Bhārata had her industries at Sutkagen-dor, the trading Harappan outpost and at some other towns of Sumer. The Aurvas learned from them the metallurgical art, and they had become excellent fire metallurgists at Ur. With such Brahmāryan ground and naval forces, Indra advanced through Gedrosia to Bhārata.

Beginning of Brahmāryan Invasions

Sutkagen-dor was the far western trading outpost of Harappan State 300 miles west of Karachi.[23] It was a fortified station for sea-borne trade up the Persian gulf.[24] Jiwanry is another sea-port in south Baluchistan. At these ports, naval battles were fought between the Brahmāryan and the Bhāratīya forces. Who were in occupation of this Harappan region during those times ?

21. Leonard Woolley—Excavations at Ur, 1955, page 198.

22 Leonard Woolley—op. cit., page 50.

23. Mortimer Wheeler, The Indus Civilization, 1953, page 2.

24. S. Piggot, op. cit., page 137, 210.

We learn from the Ṛgveda that peoples known as Pañchajanāḥ inhabited the river Saraswatī region [25] The River Saraswatī crossed right upto the ocean and joined it.[26] The Saraswatī was the most important river to the Ṛgvedic people. The Ṛgveda speaks of seven sisters or seven tributaries of the Saraswatī. [27] It appears probable that Sindhu (Indus) with its five tributaries Vitastā (Jhelum), Asiknī (Chenab), Paruṣṇī (Iravati or Ravi), Vipāś (Beas) and Śutudrī (Sutlej) joined the great Saraswatī river a little above the sea-shore near about Chanhu-daro, a few miles south of Mohenjodaro and this great Saraswatī river joined by other rivers flowed to the ocean. This literary evidence is corroborated by the geological evidence that this sacred Saraswatī river in the Vedic times flowed to the sea through the eastern Punjab and Rajputana.[28] The Pañchajanāḥ who inhabited the Saraswatī Valley region were the Yadus, the Turvaśas, the Pūrus, the Anus and the Druhyus.[29] The Yadus and the Turvaśas were the sea-faring people and good navigators The Pūrus, the Anus and the Druhyus were the plains people. The Pūrus occupied the northern part of the Saraswatī region. The Anus and the Druhyus had their strongholds in the middle of the Saraswatī region. The Yadus and the Turvaśas occupied the southern and south western portion of the Saraswatī region occupying northwest Rajasthan and Sindh territories extending upto the mouth of the Saraswatī, close to the sea-shore. [30] West to the mouth of the Saraswatī flourished the sea-port city of Sutkagendor which was controlled by the people who were masters of the Harappan State. Nearest people to them were the Yadus and the Turvaśas, hence it appears all the more probable that the masters of the sea-borne trade and export navigators, the Yadus and the Turvaśas, extended their decentralised re-publican organisation upto Sutkgen-dor. These five peoples

25. Ṛgveda 6. 5. 12. 12.
26. Ṛgveda 7. 6. 6. 2.
27. Ṛgveda 6. 5. 12. 10.
28. D. N. Wadia–Geology of India, 1958; page 56–389.
29. (1) Radhakumud Mukerjee—Ancient India, 1956, page 54.
(2) A. C. Dass—Ṛgvedic Culture, 1925; page 160.
30. A. C. Dass—op. cit; page 353.

or five republics (Pañchajanāḥ) were non-Āryan pre-Āryan people of Bhārata.[31]

Naval Battles

Sutkagen-dor could not have easily been surrendered by the Yadus and the Turvaśas as it was the life-line of their foreign trade. A well-fought naval battle must have been waged here bp the contending forces in which the Bhāratīya forces seem to have been annihilated by the invaders. Their battle-ships were drowned and they suffered large-scale casualties. The victorious Brahmāryan Commander-in-chief Indra, also a shrewd politician, brought some of the Yadus and the Turvaśas, having crossed the ocean,[32] safe to the sea-shore He entered into an alliance of friendship with them so that he may know something of the country he was in near future to conquer for the sake of wealth.[33] Jiwanry people who were very near to the Sutkagen-dor people must have come to their assistance and shared the same fate. After its destruction, it was occupied by the Brahmāryan invaders and we find their cemeteries here which have been dated 1100–1000 B. C.[34] In the same period, the Brahmāryan land forces occupied Shahi Tump. Shahi Tump cemetery of the Āryan warrior is contemporary with the fall of Harappa culture and it has its nearest parallel, significantly enough, with the princely graves of the chieftains of barbarian tribes beyond the fringe of the oriental urban civilizations at Maikop and Tsarkaya in south Russia.[35] This conclusively proves that they were the same Asiāryans who had entered Iran from Russian Turkistan Circa 2000 B. C. After these battles, we witness a peaceful era. The Brahmāryan armies felt a little fatigued and some of them were summoned to the north where ferocious conflicts were in full swing. The Mohenjodorians might have sensed the ensuing danger and the

31. R. C. Jain, Chapter IV Supra.

32. Ṛgveda 6. 2. 5. 12.

33. Ṛgveda 6. 5. 12. 5.

34. S. Piggot, op. cit.; pages 240–256.

35. S. Piggot, op. cit; pages 62, 114, 219, 220.

adjoining belt might have stood in unity which might have halted the advance of the invading forces. But some of the components of the Brahmāryans specially the Aurvas, who might have developed some intimate contacts with the Yadus and the Turvaśas pushed their peaceful penetration to the east. The Aurvas peacefully occupied the cities of Jhukar, Lohumjodaro and Chanhu-daro without any opposition and without any burning or violent destruction of these cities. These people, in archaeological parley, are known as the Jhukar people.

The Jhukar People

As shown earlier, Piggot parallels Hissar III, Anau III and Jhukar and D. H. Gordon accepts his conclusions and assigns the date Circa 1800 B. C. for the period of Invasions.[36] He later modifies his chronology and assigns the date Circa 1750–1300 B C. to the Āryan invasions.[37] The Jhukar people had peaceful friendly relations with the people of Mohenjodaro and did not take part in its destruction, when Mohenjodaro fell to the invading forces. They came to Bhārata before the invaders of Mohenjodaro came. Hence he presumes that the Āryans occupied Jhukar Circa 1800 B. C.[38]

This hypothesis is full of inherent internal contradictions even from the archaeological standpoint. The conventional date of the first incursion of the Āryan invaders into India has generally been accepted by eminent scholars including Wheeler, Woolley, Majumdar and Piggot, Circa 1500 B. C.[39] The

36. D. H. Gordon—op. cit; (Ancient India No. 10 & 11), page 168.
37. D. H. Gordon—op. cit. (P. B. I. C.), page 87.
38. D. H. Gordon—op. cit. (P. B. I. C.), page 82
39. (1) M. Wheeler–Harappa 1946. The difences and competery p. 37, Ancient India No. 3, page 81.
(2) Leonard Woolley—History Unearthed, 1958, page 82.
(3) Majumdar—Ṛgvedic civilization in the light of Archaeology, Annals of Bhandarker Oriental Research Institute, Volume 40 page 4.
(4) S Piggot—op. cit., page 241.

first incursion (into Harappa State) not the final destruction, that is very important here.

Occupation of Jhukar by the Brahmāryans Circa 1800 B. C. is imporbable on the following grounds—

1. Mohenjodaro, according to Gordon himself, fell Circa 1550 B. C. There is no explanation of the hiatus of 250 years in between.

2. Piggot compares certain spiral headed pins, animal headed pins and rods from Jhukar sites and a mace head from Chanhu-daro with certain west Asian parellels, dates them a few centuries earlier to 2000 B. C. [40] from which Gordon comes at the dating of 1800 B. C. for Jhukar culture as given above. But at another place, Piggot states that Jhukar people came as the destroyers of the Harappan civilization or following hard in the wake of the first raiders.[41] The Harappan culture was destroyed not earlier than 1500 B. C. hence this contradiction remains inexplicable.

3. Piggot has earlier said that the Shahi Tump cemetery is contemporary with the fall of the Harappa culture Then it obviously cannot belong to circa 1800 B. C.

4. The dating of Hissar III is 2300-2100 B. C. [42] Anau III is parallelled with Hissar III. If Jhukar is parallelled with them, the situation becomes ludicrous.

5. This dating betrays the other conclusions the west Asian archaeoloIy has arrived at. When the Elamite Mountains were subject to the hardship of Babylonian Hammurabi's dynasty Circa 1700 B. C., the weaker people could not have advanced to the east. They were busy consolidating their power in the northern and the southern Iran to wrest power from Babylonia.

6. This dating has not given due value to the significant historical remarks of Mortimer Wheeler. The area of the

40. S. Piggot—Notes on certain metal pins and a mace head in Harappa culture, Ancient India No. 4 page 39.

41. S. Piggot. op. cit. (Pre-Historic India), page 226.

42. S. Piggot—op. cit. (Pre-Historic India), page 63.

region that the Brahmāryans had to cover was so vast that no succession of invaders from the little lands of the western plateux could fill such a vastness ..... It was a question simply of pushing forward until impetus ceased and initiation supervened. The sole frontier was that imposed by the stamina and discipline of the invader He acknowledges the triumph of sheer acreage over the puny efforts of man whose delimiting factor was not only mountain, desert, vast acreage but also human fatigue.[43] The Asiāryans could not also simply walk from Maikop and Tsarkaya in south Russia to Chanhu-daro on the Saraswati river within 200 years.

Indian archaeology also does not corroborate the view of D. H. Gordon. Mohenjodaro after its fall was not occupied by the invaders. We find cemetery H at Harappa which belongs to some foreign invaders. There is a clear debris that intervenes the ruined city and those foreign graves. It does not show the occupation of the invaders whom Gordon calls Ravi people but only that these people burried their dead there. It is more probable that their settlement was just near the ruined Harappan city and they used the Harappan site only for the disposal of their dead. Cemetery H people, on the strength of their pottery, are called the grey-ware people. At Ruper on the Sutlej river in the Punjab, the Harappan habitation is succeeded after a distinct break by the grey-ware culture.[44] At Hastinapur, the grey-ware culture is found in period III which has been assigned the date Circa 1100 to Circa 800 B. C. If we take the mean date, we come to the conclusion that the grey-ware people came to occupy Hastinapur Circa 1000 or 950 B. C. We also witness a distinct break of occupation between periods II and I.[45] In the new dried up Ghaggar bed, the ancient Saraswati, about three dozen or more Harappan sites have been located. The holy rivers. Saraswatī and Dṛṣadwatī had their confluence three miles

43. Mortimer Wheeler-Editorial, Ancient India No. 4, page 3.

44. B. Subbarao—Personality of India, 1958, page 100.

45. B. B. Lall—Execavations at Hastinapur and other explorations, Ancient India No. 10 & 11, page 23.

north of Rangmahal, the epi-centre of the Rangmahal culture, in Ganganagar District of Rajasthan State.[46] Numerous grey-ware sites have been located in this archaeologically very important region, but no grey-ware settlement is found on the Harappan settlements. It seems that the people who used grey-ware pottery as a rule avoided settling on the old Harappan sites.[47] It is most likely that it was a general habit of the grey-ware people that they avoided settlement or immediate settlement on the ruins of the cities they destroyed in their battles with the Bhāratīyans. Even if some of the sites have been occupied, they had been occupied after distinct breaks.

The scholars are veering round the view, though hesitatingly due to circumstantial nature of the evidence, that the cemetery H people or Grey Ware people or Ravi people were noneelse than the Āryans who had ruthlessly destroyed the Bhāratīyan strongholds. To the criticism that it is premature to identify these people with Āryans, the remarks of A. Ghose that it is doubly premature to say that the Āryans had nothing to do with the disappearance of the Harappans[48] are very significant. The existence of the grey-ware people in Bhārata during the period of violent destruction of Harappan State and .the non-existence of any other foreign power in this period in this region clearly proves and should be accepted as clearly proving that these people were noneelse than Āryans.

Then, how can we explain the general habit of the Brahmāryans avoiding settlements on the ruined Harappan cities? There may be three reasons for this situation. Firstly, the Brahmāryan military onslaught was planned on a grand scale for the purpose of whole-sale simultaneous extermination of their adversaries, and the destruction of their strongholds. They were constantly on the move without preferring any fixed abode or settlement. They took to settlement only after their final victory became secure. Secondly, the wholesale massacre of the Bhāratiyans by the foreign invading army

46. Hannah Rydh–Rangmahal, 1959, Figure 8. The number has now increased to morethem fifty
47 Hannah Rydh, op. cit , page 42.
48. A. Ghose, Editial (Ancient India No. 10 & 11) page 3.

on the battle-fields led them to abandon their towns and cities and they fled in the directions they found secure. Before fleeing, they pulled down their houses whereby the streets were filled with filth and debris. The ruined cities presented the pictures of dead cities. After this almost wholesale abandonment, the ruined cities were plundered by the victorious invaders where stray cases of arson and murder also occurred. That is the evidence Mohenjodaro and Harappa provide us. It appears that the vanquished followed the scortch-earth policy before they left their dear homes for ever, never to occupy them in future. In this process, the ruined cities became unfit for habitation and they did not remain attractive to the Brahmāryans for their dwelling. Thirdly the Brahmāryans wanted to avoid any contact with the Bhāratīyans and their culture in the beginning. This separatist mentality is clearly visible in the Rgveda. The Brahmāryan rsis prayed Indra to keep the darkskinned Dasyus and Rāksasas away from them. Indra crushed Vrtra but did not occupy his town and leaving it on the left hand advanced forward. Indra after slaying the Dasyus did not occupy their towns. He only divided their fields amongst his white-complexioned friends. These Ṛgvedic references[49] clearly prove the truth of the hiatus existing between the ruination of the city and the future contact of the ruiner with it. Apart from corroborating the existence of this archaeological truth, they also definitely explain the causes of this state of affairs. Even if we assume the negligible military opposition of the Bhāratīyans to the Brahmāryans, this evidence of Indian archaeology clearly establishes that it was very hard and tough affair for the Brahmāryans to scatter and settle over this vast area. It took sufficiently long time

In this discussion for the fixation of chronology, Hastināpura gives the final judgment. Hastināpura was occupied last circa 10 0 B. C. by the Brahmāryans after they had destroyed Harappa and other connected places during the Dāśarājña war. Lall concludes from the inscriptional evidence from Boghaz

49. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 4. 5; 2. 1. 11. 18; 1. 16 ". 18.

Keui that the Āryan-speaking people had made their appearance in western Asia by the fourteenth century B. C. Moving eastwards they are likely to have reached the Ghaggar and Sutlej Valleys during the following couple of centuries.[50] This dating would resolve all the inherent contradictions and improbabilities that have arisen due to the wrong assumption of the aforesaid date.

The Ṛgveda is the nearest narrative of the Brahmāryan military victories and it may be appropriately designated as the commemoration volume presented to Indra for firmly establishing the Brahmāryan hegemony in Bhārata The Rgveda was redacted in its present final available form circa 1000 B C.[51] It narrates times without number the martial exploits of Indra He enjoys more power and prestige than Varuna in Bhārata whose inferior he was in western Asia where Varuna's supremacy over Indra is unmistakably established by the said Boghaz Keui treaty. We find a colloquy between Varuṇa and Indra in the Ṛgveda.[52] Here Varuna's previous glory as a peaceful leader had given place to the martial exploits of Indra He had to give in to Indra and accept a position subordinate to him. A. C. Das also holds that abilities of Indra to lead men to war and victory gave him the position of supremacy over Varuna who was the upholder of the eternal laws and order of the universe.[53] This clearly establishes that Varuna was the supreme leader of the Asiāryans till 1400 B. C. but after this date his position began to dwindle. Indra took over the supreme leadership of the more aggressive section of the undivided stock and consolidated their supreme power in Bhārata within 300 years.

To fix up the chronology of Jhukar people within this broad ambit, we need now to explain the important fact i.e. who are the Jhukar people? May they be identified with

50. B. B. Lall, op. cit. page 150.

51. (1) B. K. Ghose, op. cit. (Vedic Age), page 225.

(2) A. S. Altekar—Presidental Address printed in proceedings of Twenty-second Indian History Congress, page 100.

52. Ṛgveda 4. 4. 10.

53. A. C. Dass—op. cit., page 85.

any of the Brahmāryan tribe ? Who were the successors of these Jhukar people, the expert mariners, the good navigators, the efficient firecraftsmen, the experienced traders and the excellent naval soldiers ?

Jhukar People became Bhṛgus

In the Ṛgveda, we have certain references to a Brahma tribe called the Bhṛgus. Bhṛgu is father of Agni, also his friend. The Bhṛgus cherish and glorify Agni. They knew the use of Agni in waters and on earth. Agni gave them wealth. Agni was their benefactor. The Bhṛgus placed Agni by the strength of all beings upon the naval of the earth. [54] The Bhṛgus were great navigators, expert mariners and enterprising tradesmen. They were the agents of the foreigners. [55]

The Bhṛgus were connected with Anus, one of the constituents of the people who formed the Dāśarājña or Ten-Republics confederacy. The Anus were led by them in the Dāśarājña war. [56] After the destruction of Mohenjodaro, I discuss just below that Mohenjodaro fell before Harappa, Ten Bhāratīya Republics including the Pañchajanāḥ already alluded to and the Ajas, the Śigrus, the Yakṣas, the Matsyas and the Vrchīvants combined together and formed a confederacy under the leadership of Viśvāmitra They were collectively called the Bharatas.[57] Their troops crossed the Paruṣṇī (Modern Ravi) to the west of which was the seat of the Harappa state, the Hariyūpīya (Modern Harappa) where Vṛchīvants joined them. The first battle of the Dāśarājña war was severely fought on the waters of Paruṣṇī.

54. (1) Ṛgveda 6. 1. 15. 2, 1. 11. 1. 6, 1. 19. 1. 7; 4. 1. 7. 1; 3. 1. 2. 4. 1. 21. 4. 4
(2) Atharvaveda 18-1-58; 20. 10. 2; 4. 14. 5.
(3) Taittiriya Saṁhitā 1. 5. 5. 1; 2. 12. 6; 4. 6 5. 2; 6. 5. 8. 6.
55. A. D. Pusalkar ; Purāṇa; Volume 3 Part I Page 19.
56. Radhakumud Mukerjee, op. cit., page 55.
57. R. C. Jain, Pre-Āryan Bharatas of Bhārata; read before the Twenty-third Session of Indian History Congress at Aligarh in Ancient India Section on 27. 12. 1960.

The Bhṛgus took part in this naval battle on the side of the Bhāratīya forces. [58]

These qualities of the Bhrgus appear suprisingly similar to those of the Jhukar people I have no hesitation in identifying the Jhukar people with the Bhṛgus. This identification here would help us in appreciating better the evidence that further corroborates this identity.

The Bhṛgus are associated with the southern region of the Saraswatī valley They are closely associated with the Yadus. They took to the southern direction for their activities. They founded the port of Bhṛgukachchha. Later the Bhrgus had much to do with the Narmada valley. The archaeological explorations in the Narmada valley have yielded a widely distributed influence of the Jhukar people over the chalcolithic culture of the south. This shows the spreading of the influence of the Jhukar people to the south. [59] We do not find any evidence of the spreading of the influence of the Jhukar people in the north from any archaeological site.

Gordon maintains that even after the occupation of these towns by the Jhukar people, Mohenjodaro continued to hold its own against the invaders. The expert navigators and experienced tradesmen saw big possibilities of profit by coming to terms with the people of Mohenjodaro as it was international commercial port during those times. They came to terms with them and established peaceful contacts. They might have also allied with the citizens of Mohenjodaro [60] The Ṛgveda provides us with clearer evidence of such compromises and influences. Before Āryan invasions, Bhārtaīya people followed the culture and civilization of Munis and Śramanas. The Brahmāryans came in contact with this prevedic pre-Āryan culture of Munis and Śramanas. [61] The Auravas, the progressive section of the Brahmāryans, tended

58. Ṛgveda 3. 3. 11-12; 7. 2 1. 6.

59. H D. Sankalia—The Excavations at Maheswar and Navdatoli, 1958, Page 250.

60. D. H. Gordon—op cit, (P. B. I. C.), page 80.

61. G. C. Pande-Studies in the Origins of Buddhism, 1957, page 261.

to mingle with this culture. They, like other Brahmāryans, were the wealth-seeking, power hungary and materialistic people that they could not adopt the complete non-violent conduct of the munis and the śramanas. They mixed some of the spiritual qualities of a Muni to their materialist way and became Yatis.[62] These Yati Bhrgus had not renounced wealth. Indra plunders the wealth of his non-sacrificing adversaries and gives that over to Yati Bhṛgus.[63] The institution of Yati-ship is a compromise between spiritualism, of the original inhabitants of Bhārata and, materialism, of the invading foreigner Brahmāryans. The Bhrgus were the first Yatis. It was under the influence of the spiritual culture of Bhārata that Jhukar people maintained friendly relations with the Bhāratīyans.

The Ṛgveda and the Ṛgvedic Brāhmana, the Aitareya Brāhmana, know Aurva Bhrgus.[64] Taittirīya Samhitā mentions Aurva Bhṛgus.[65] Aurva Bhṛgu means Bhṛgu descended from Aurva. The Pañchavimśa Brāhmana considers Jāmadagnyas as Aurvas, the descendants of Urva.[66] Authors of Vedic Index corroborate him.[67] Jamadagni is mentioned in the Ṛgveda and later scriptural literature several times but nowhere he has been given the fatherhood of Rchīka from the Ṛgveda down through the Upanisadic literature to Pāṇini. Ṛchīka as father of Jamadagni is a pure fabrication of the Mahābhārata though Ṛchīka has also been admitted to be a son of Aurva,[68] which admission perhaps could not be avoided. It was not earlier than second century B. C. when the Bhārgava recension of the great epic was under sway.[69] Before this great epic,

62. Ṛgveda 8. 2. 1. 18.

63. Ṛgveda 8. 1. 3. 9.

64. Ṛgveda 8. 10. 9. 4; Aitereya Brāhmaṇa 633.

65. S. D. Satvalekar—Taittirīya Samhitā, 1957, 3. 1. 11. 6, page 117.

66. W. Calland—Panchavimśa-Brāhmaṇa, 1931; 21. 10, 5-6-7. page 563.

67. Macdonell & Keith; Vedic Index, Volume I page 129, 1958 Ed.

68. Mahābhārata 1. 60. 45-46.

69. V. S. Sukathankar—Annals of Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Volume 18, page 76.

Jamadagni is, significantly enough, remembered as an Aurva only, never son of Ṛchīka.

The Bhṛgus are mentioned in some of the late post-Mahāvīra Upaniṣads but they have not been connected either with Ṛchīka or Aurva. This shows that Aurva was getting to be forgotten and Ṛchīka had not yet been speculated. The evidence from the Vedic and the Brahmaṇic literature does not make reference to any mythical Ṛṣi Bhṛgu belonging to hoary past in the good old days when the Āryans were still undivided people and the Aurva descending from Bhārgava Chyavana or any other descendant of Bhṛgu. But it clearly proves the descent of Bhṛgus from Aurva. These references to Aurva-Bhṛgus are very significant and they are directly corroborated by the archaeological evidence. The settlers on Jhukar sites were also Aurva; the citizens of the Babylonian city, Ur. Archaeology and literature happily find a meeting place here.

Did Jamadagni flourish before or as contemporary to the Dāśarājña war ? Vasiṣṭha was the leader of the Tṛtsus. He gave a great helping hand to Sudās in organising Brahmāryan forces against Ten-Republics confederacy under Viśvāmitra. The River Saraswatī is spoken of being glorified by Vasiṣṭha. Before him, Saraswatī was glorified by Jamadagni.[70] It proves the antiquity of Jamadagni to Vasiṣṭha. It appears that Aurva Jamadagni was member of the invading Brahmāryan military forces and was the leader of those Aurvas who settled in Chanhudaro and other sites before Vasiṣṭha rose to power.

We know from the Ṛgveda that Indra wielded his war weapon, the thunderbolt. Whatever may be the other weapons with the Aurvas, we definitely find them weilding an ancient weapon of war, the Axe. Gordon Childe[71] and S. Piggot[72] maintain that Copper Shaft-Hole Axes have been found at Jhukar culture sites and at Shahi-Tump cemetery. Jamadagni, though later a peaceful ṛṣi, was earlier a wielder of the Axe. Bhārgava

70. Ṛgveda 7. 6. 7. 3.

71. Gordon Childe—New Light on the Most Ancient East, 1958, page 187.

72. S. Piggot, op. cit. (Pre-historic India), Figure 27, page 225.

Paraśurāma was the Axe hero par execellence. The association of Axe with the Bhṛgus and the Jhukar people goes a long way to prove their identity.

Mohenjodaro Conquered Prior to Harappa

Incidentally one mistake of history often committed by oriental scholars stands corrected here. It is generally assumed, though mistakenly, that Harappa fell first and then Mohenjodaro. Gordon believes this theory.[73] We definetely find the Bhrgus partaking in the Dāśarājña war but we do not find any Bhrgu or Jhukar settlement in the north nor the influence of the Jhukar culture on the cultures of the Sutlej Valley, the Saraswatī Valley or the Yamuna Valley. If Bhrgus would have gone south after the Dāśarājña war; they must have had some settlements alongside the settlements of the Brahmāryan adversaries from whom they laid down their lives in the battle. We also find the Jhukar culture as the successor of the Harappa culture after the extinction of the former at Jhukar, Lohumjodaro and Chanhudaro unlike the Brahmāryan settlements in the north where we do not find their cultures as the immediate successor culture of the extinct Harappa cultures. Further the Dāśarājña war was the last in which the Bhṛgus took part. There was no further war fought between the Brahmāryans and their adversaries the Bharatas; hence the battle in which Mohenjodaro fell must have been fought before the Dāśarājña war in which Hariyūpīya (Harappa) fell. The Saraswatī Valley and Punjab explorations reveal that the Brahmāryans advanced to the east after their Punjab and Rajasthan battles to fight the last battles of the Dāśarājña war with the Ajas, the Śigrus and the Yakṣas under the leadership of Bheda[74] and not to the south. All these factors point to the conclusion that Mohenjodaro fell prior to Harappa. It seems that after the fall of Mohenjodaro; the Yadus and the Turvaśas, alongwith their allies the Bhṛgus, the successors of the Jhukar people, went to the north to join the other members of Pañchajanāḥ, the

---

73. D. H. Gordon, op. cit., (Ancient India No. 10 & 11) p. 170.

74. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1. 18–19.

Anus and the Druhyus, where Viśvāmitra was busy organising the last opposition to the advancing Brahmāryan foreigners.

The foregoing discussion thus discloses that the Bhṛgus, not the Yadus, the Turvaśas or the Vrchivants, were the successors of the Jhukar people. It would be more correct to say that these Jhukar people which is only an archaeological epithet, were called the Aurvas in the beginning and later they began to be known as the Bhrgus. How did that happen ?

Origin of the Bhṛgus

Dr. Herman Weller has made an attempt to prove that the word Bhṛgu goes back to the Āryan (Indo-European or Indo-Germanic) origin. He believes that the Bhṛgu was originally a surname (Or nickname) coined by the Āryans. He has given detailed study of various Indo-Germanic, Latin and Greek roots and has come to the conclusion that those differ-ent roots may be traced back to the Zero grade form bhlg.[75] It appears that Weller was misled by the association of fire with the Bhrgus and hence some such word was sought to be traced which gave the sense of "sparkle, conflagaration or inflammation.' We do find the association of fire with the Aurvas, the predecessors of the Jhukar people, but this quality of the Aurvas did not continue with their successors, at last we do not find any such material evidence after they occupied the three Jhukar towns. They did not burn any of the town. Word Aurva does not connote any sense of "sparkle or con-flagaration."

Dr. Weller, contradicting himself, gives Indid Origin [76] to the Bhṛgus by which he means pre-Āryan origin. He is only partially correct here. The Bhṛgus were the result of the Brahma-Bhāratīya ethnic mixture. But he is correct so far as the philological aspect is concerned. Though he considers Yāska as decidedly mistaken yet it is the etymology of Yāska that corroborates his thesis.

75. Dr. Hermann Weller—Who were Bhṛguids ? Annals of Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Volume 18 page 299-300.

76. Dr. H. Wheeler, op. cit. page 301.

Before we trace the Indid origin of the word Bhṛgu, we must know the language the Bharatas spoke during that age.[77] Sylvain Levi, Prezyluski and Jules Bloch made a special study of the Bhāratīya language before the advent of the Āryans (Indo-Europeans) in Bhārata. Levi maintains that Pulinda-Kulinda, Kokala-Mekala, (with the group Uḍra-Puṇḍra-Muṇḍa), Kośala, Tośala, Anga, Banga, Kalinga-Talinga form the links of a long chain which extends from the eastern confines of Kashmir upto the centre of peninsula. The process of formation is foreign to Indo-European, it is foreign to Dravidian; it is on the contrary characteristic of the vast family of languages which are called Austro-Asiatic.[78] Beyond the peninsula, the southern Bhārata is referred to as Udāntya; outside the Brahmāryan limits in the Aitareya Brāhmana. The Andhras, the Puṇḍras, the Śabaras, the Pulindas and the Mutibas[79] inhabited the land They were the Dasyus born of the blood of Dasyu-Chief Viśvāmitra. The Aitareya Brāhmana belongs to circa 800–700 B. C. Archaeology is liberal to literature at least in this case. Sankalia dates pre-Dravidian chalcolithic age circa 1000 B.C [80] The pre-Dravidian chalcolithic people were Muṇḍa-speaking.[81] Thus we find that the whole of Bhārata during the age of the Brahmāryan invasions spoke Austro-Asiatic languages and its variants.

Word 'Bhṛgu' is the Sanskritized form of the Austric word 'Bharu.' Word 'Bharu' is a word of folk dialect still spoken by the people of Rajasthan and Gujrat. Word 'Bharu' in local dialect means 'endowed with much, full of many qualities.' When Aurvas became influenced by the spiritual culture of their neighbours; they became Yatis and hence imbibed many good qualities according to the local spiritual standards. The local inhabitants began to call the Aurvas 'Bhrgus' and

77. Jean Prezylaski; Pre-Āryan and Pre-Dravidian in India, p. 37.
78. Sylvain Levi; Pre-Āryan & Pre-Dravidian in India, 1929, p. 95.
79. A. B. Keith; Ṛgveda Brāhmaṇa; 1920, Aitareya Brāhmana 7. 18. p. 307.
80. H. D. Sankalia; op. cit., Preface page XIII.
81. D. H. Gordon; op. cit., (P. B. I. C.) page 172.

gave them this name. One other explanation is also possible. The Aurvas migrated from south Saraswatī region to Kachchha which lay in its vicinity and from there, they advanced towards the non-Āryan Bharu-Land. Bharu, in the pre-Vedic days, was the name of a non-Āryan country. It also signified the non-Āryan people of this land. Aurvas mixed with the people of this region. They became one with them, adopted their name and Sanskritized it to Bhṛgu This Bharu land was in the Narmada region and it had an important sea-port named 'Bharu-achchha' or 'Bharukachchha.' As ealier shown, these non-Āryan people spoke the Austric language. The Austro-Asiatic word 'Bharukachchha' [82] of the people and land of Bharus was later Sanskritized into Bhrgukachchha.

The meaning of the Sanskrit word 'Bhrgu' is merely the extension of the meaning of the Austric word 'Bharu.' Yāska traces the word Bhrgu to √भ्रज्ज 'to roast' in the light of a legend. It may also be used in the sense of √भ्रज्ज (परिपाके) 'to be ripe' or √भ्रज्ज (तैक्ष्ण्ये) 'Sharpened.' They all give almost identical senses One who has 'roasted' his physical needs by self-control like a Yati or one who has become 'ripe' in the practise of spiritual virtues or one whose spiritual conduct has 'sharpened' or sublimated his material way would be called a Bhṛgu. Though the Bhṛgus could not totally renounce their martial activities but in the end they always felt sorry for that and to expiate the sins of violence they invariably took to ascetic penances It appears that the Aurvas, after their acceptance of the spiritual institution of Yati-ship, came to be known as 'Bharus' or Bhṛgus. Philology thus establishes the 'Indid' origin of the word 'Bhrgu.'

It seems to me that the Aurvas after they were christened Bharus or Bhṛgus took their new ethnic surname to Meditarranean after the disturbed conditions in Bhārata settled

82. (1) Pandit Hargovind Das T. Sheth—Pala Sadda-Mahaṇṇavo; 1928, p. 800. He relies upon Dr. W. Keirfel, Leipzig, 1920, Cosmography Der Inder; op. cit., page 5.

(2) H. D. Sankalia—Studies in the Historical & Cultural Geography of Gujrat; 1949 page 162-163.

and the external trade again began to flourish. The Bhṛgus, the expert mariners and excellent tradesmen through the sea-routes, must have revived their trade through the ports of the Persian Gulf to Egypt and the Mediterranean. It may seem probable that the corrupt forms of this word in Greek and Latin roots might have been derived from the Zero-grade form Bhlg. But peculiarly enough, we do not find any word approaching the word Bhṛgu in the languages of Iran, Assyria and Anotolia. It was due to the reason that the Bhṛgus never took to trade through land routes and hence the word 'Bhṛgu' did not travel through these lands. Had the word Bhṛgu been of Āryan origin (Indo-European or Indo-Germanic Origin), we must have found some word identical with it in these languages as we do find equivalent words for Varuṇa, Aṅgiras, Indra, Mitra, Nāsatyas, Yajña and a host of other words. It conclusively establishes that the Bhṛgus got their name in Bhārata and not anywhere else outside Bhārata and this word travelled from Bhārata to the Mediterranean.

One knotty problem still remains to be analysed before we determine the date of the advent of the Bhṛgus into Bhārata. We have Purāṇic genealogies which assign traditional dates to different families. Of course, they have to be scientifically examined in the light of other sources; viz. West Asian Archaeology, Indian Archaeology and the Vedic or the primarily Ṛgvedic tests.

Chronology

It appears that the traditional history began to take some shape in the third century B. C. Magasthenes knew the Indian tradition which believed that to the days of Alexander the Great; their kings were reckoned at 154 whose reign extended over 6451 years and 3 months. Arrian gives the tradition of 153 Kings and a period of 6042 years. [83] But the Purāṇic chronology differently worked in different Purāṇas contradicting each other, later went beyond the beginning of the hypothetical Kali age at 3102 B. C. and covered the

83. I. W. Mccrindle—Ancient India as described by Megasthenes and Arrian. 1960, pages 116, 208.

Satya, the Tretā and the Dvāpar ages. We get fantastic dates in the Purānas. The Dvāpara covers a longer period than yet the unfinished Kali. The Tretā and the Satya cover still longer and longer periods taking us to the unknown hoary past. Pargiter was the first critical scholar who gave rational interpretation to the Purāṇic chronology. A. D. Pusalkar has brought the beginning of the Manu Vaivasvata era of the Satya age to 3102 B C., the beginning of the Kali Age. To Bhṛgu he assigns the same date though he places Paraśurāma period Circa 2550–2350 B. C or Circa 2150–1950 B C.[84] A. S. Altekar further brings down the Purāṇic chronology to 2000 B. C.[85] Jamadagni and Paraśurāma came after 31 generations from Manu and calculating at the average of 15 years, proposed by Altekar, we get the age of Jamadagni (31 × 15 = 465 = 2000 – 465 = 1535) at a 1535 B. C. The traditional historians are now veering round the view arrived at by critical scientific historians Altekar forgets the factors of vastness of acreage and of human fatigue when he differs from the conventional archaeological date of 1500 B. C. and arrives at 2000 B. C. which is totally wrong and unfounded, particularly when he assumes the entry of the Āryans into Iran from South Russia also Circa 2000 B. C His theory of separate independant migration to Bhārata has no force. Rāma appeared 65 generations after Manu and the Dāśarājña war took place four or three generations after Rāma.[86] The date of the Dāśarājña war is thus (68 × 15 = 1020 = 2000–1020 = 980) arrived at circa 980 B. C. Altekar assumes the date of the Mahābhārata war at 950 B. C., hence making liberal allowance for some intervening mistakes, we may advance the age of the Dāśarājña war to 1100 B. C.

Now we are in a position to fill in the details of the broad ambit of our chronology. The sporadic Irānāryan contacts with Bhārata began Circa 1500 B. C. They, in the

84. A. D. Pusalkar-Traditional History from the Earliest Time in Vedic Age, 1957, pages 276, 279.

85. A. E. Altekar, op. cit. (Presidential Address), page 25.

86. A. D. Pusalkar, op. cit., page 270.

natural way of the invaders, began their peaceful penetrations into Bhārata by this time; partly through land routes and partly through oceanic routes. They carried on this process for about 100 years. The defeat of the Mittanies in the Hittite-Mittani War circa 1400 B. C. divided the rank and file and also the leadership of Varuna and Indra. The heroic, adventurous and all through victorious people could not swallow the ignominous defeat and fall in their martial standards. The internal bickerings and dissensions, though till now not apparent under the clock of ethnic unity, accellerated the process of disintegration and division. Indra and his associate leaders unified their people and efficiently organised their war machine somewhere about 1350 B. C. nearabout the Elaimite Mountains. Aurvas were the commanders of their navy They reached the borders of western Bhārata circa 1300 B C. and took a pause. The Aurvas in the company of the Yadus and the Turvaśas proceeded to Bhārata and settled themselves on the three Jhukar sites in south Saraswati Valley circa 1275 B. C. After the pause, the Branmāryans renewed their military operations circa 1240 B C or so and Mohenjodaro fell Circa 1225–1200 B. C. After the fall of Mohenjodaro; the Brahmāryans organised themselves under Sudās, Indra and Vasiṣṭha and the Bhāratiyans formed the Ten-Republics confederacy under the leadership of Dasyu-Chief Viśvāmitra. The Dāśarājña war was fought and lost Circa 1150 B. C

Bṛgu Agni

The Bhṛgus were a great people. They have intimately been associated with Agni Agni-Bhrgu relationship may be placed at par with Agni-Aṅgiras relationship. The Aṅgirasas had invented Land Agni. The Bhṛgus discovered Agni latent in waters.[87] The Bhṛgus worshipped Agni in waters and established amongst men.[88] The Bhrgus saluted Agni after its generation.[89] The Agni discovered from waters may be christened Bhṛgu Agni.

---

87 Ṛgveda 10. 4. 4. 2.

88. Ṛgveda 2. 1. 4. 2

89. Ṛgveda 1. 19. 1. 7.

Hybrid Bhṛgus

The Bhṛgus had joined the Dāśarājña confederacy as Purohita of the Anus. They are associated with the Druhyus and the Turvaśas against Sudās in the Dāśarājña war.[90] It appears that some of the Bhṛgus in association with the Turvaśas of the south came to the Anu-Druhyu people in the north and coalseed with them. They had so much identified themselves with their new masters that they, at their instance, fought against their own kinsman in the Dāśarājña war and suffered defeat at their hands. They had been converted to the Bhāratīya way of life. They were convert Bharatas. But Indra, the shrewd politician, appreciated the value of the patronage of the Bhṛgus who had become Yatis and poured on them his blessings and all material benefits. That facilitated the conversion of the Bhāratīyans through the Bhrgus. The Auravas may be pure Āryans but the Bhṛgus are a mixed tribe born of the Āryan and the non-Āryan blood. The association of the Aurava (Bhrgu) Uśanas-Śukra as Purohita of the non-Āryan Daityas and Dānavas is of great historical significance He fought against the Brahmāryan Devas on the side of the Daityas and the Dānavas. The Uśanas-Śukra legend may have been developed form RV 7. 2. 1. 6. Śukra is son of Bhrgu He married his Pitr Kanyā Go and had four sons, one of them being Tvaṣṭṛ, the Ahi, from her.[91] The son of the Bhṛgu is, thus, associated with the matriarchal system and also with the Ahi race in Bhārata This hybrid Bhṛgu tribe, under the strong influence of the Bhāratīya Śramanic culture, enjoyed a privileged position with the Bhāratīyans and laid the foundation of the Brahma-Bhāratīya culture. They, in later history, became the pioneers of the fusion of the two different ethnic peoples, two distinct cultures and two mutually opposed ways of life.

3. THE KURUS

Pūru-Purukutsa

The Pūrus were a leading constituent of the Ten-Republics confederacy (Dāśarājña war) which gave the last stiff oppo-

90. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1. 6.
91. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit. (A. I. H. T.); page 194, 196.

sition to the Brahmāryan forces under Sudās, Indra and Vaśiṣṭha. The Śatapatha Brāhmana speaks of them as Aikṣvākas. The Mallikas, the Sakyas, the Kaśis, the Kośals, the Videhas, the Licchavis and the Vaiśālies also descended from Ikṣvāku, the Manusmṛti terms then as Vrātyas. The Pūrus were the pre-Āryan Bhāratīya people. [92]

The Purāṇas mention Puru as a son of Yayāti, descendant of Nahuṣa. The Rgveda mentions both Yayāti and Nahuṣa but does not relate them as father and son. Nahusa is referred as a mortal or a man in the Ṛgveda. [93] Nahuṣa has also been mentioned as a proper person. [94] Nahusa people residing on holy river Saraswatī are also alluded to in the Ṛgveda. [95] It appears that the Nahuṣas were people of minor importance compared to the Pūrus, the Yadus, the Turvaśas and other constitutents of the Dāśarājña confederacy and they had no relation whatsoever with the Pūrus The Pūrus appear in the kernel of the Rgveda; the sixth and seventh Maṇḍals. Yayāti is a very late addition to the collection of the Ṛgvedic hymns occurring only in the first part of the First Maṇḍala and the Tenth Maṇḍala.[96] They can in no case be equated with the Purānic Nahuṣa and Yayāti. Purukutsa is the most noted Pūru warrior in the Ṛgveda. He was son of Durgaha and father (?) of Trasdasyu and belonged to the race of Giriksit. [97] Authors of Vedic Index contruct his chronology as Durgaha-Giriksit-Purukutsa-Trasdasyu [98] but this appears to be erroneous on the very face of it Durgaha is mentioned as father of Purukutsa but Giriksit is mentioned only as his predecessor. The correct chronology would therefore be Girikṣit-Durgaha-Trasdasyu.

The Pūrus, the Anus, the Druhyus, the Yadus, the Turvaśas, the Ajas, the Śigrus, the Yāksas, the Matsyas and the Vṛchivants

92. R. C. Jain, Chapter 4 Supra.
93. Ṛgveda 1 18. 2./8. 10. 11; 1. 5. 7. 16; 7. 1. 6. 5, 8. 2. 3. 3, 5. 6. 1. 3; 6. 3. 3 7.
94. Ṛgveda 1. 7. 1. 11, 8. 6. 4. 27; 7. 6. 6. 2.
95. Ṛgveda 8. 2. 1. 24.
96. Ṛgveda 1. 7. 1. 17; 10. 5. 2. 1.
97. Ṛgveda 4. 4. 10. 8; 5. 3. 1. 8; 7. 2. 2. 3; 8. 3. 7. 3. 6.
98. Macdonell and Keith—Vedic Index; 1958, page 327.

in the Dāśarājña war were collectively called Bharatas.[99] After their defeat at the hands of Sudās, the Brahmāryan Tṛtsu chief, Bharatas became his subjects.[100]

Trasadasyu, the Levirate son of Purukutsa from Indra

Purukutsa, the Pūru Chief, was taken a prisoner of war in the Dāśarājña war. He died in captivity;[101] probably he was murdered in the war-camp. He was the husband of the beautiful princess named Narmadā[102] belonging to the Avedic non-Āryan Nagna or Nāga tribe of the stock of Vṛtras, the Ahis[103] She, on the advice of seven Brahmāryan ṛsis, worshipped Indra and Varuna in consequence of which Trasdasyu was born to her.[104]

The birth of Trasdasyu has been narrated in two Rgvedic ṛcs.[105] Seer Ṛṣi is Paurukutsya Trasdasyu himself. Trasdasyu narrates his auto-biography in these ṛcs. This literature can rightly claim to be the earliest auto-biography known to mankind

Reference has been made to the worship of Purukutsāni Worship, not sacrifice, has been alluded to here. Indra and Varuna were human beings in this age and they had not yet been celestialised and raised to the status of abstract deities. They were the kinsmen of the Āryan people[106] Their worship appear to be a physical worship resulting in the submission of Narmadā, the Purukutsāni, the widow of

99 (1) Ṛgveda 3. 3 4 12

(2) R C Jain, Pre-Āryan Bharatas of Bhārata Read before Ancient India Section of Twenty-third Session of Indian History Congress held at Aligarh on 27. 12. 1960

100 Ṛgveda 7. 2 16. 6.

101 A C Dass—Ṛgvedic Culture, 1925, page 355.

102. A. D. Pusalkar, Traditional History from the Earlier Times in the Vedic Age, 1957, page 278

103 A. C Dass—op. cit., page 167.

104 H. H. Wilson -Rgveda Translation, Part III, 1926, page 366-367.

105. Ṛgveda 4. 4 10 8-9.

106. Ṛgveda 1. 6. 7. 9; 1. 16. 4. 1.

Purukutsāni, the widow of Purukutsa, to them. It has nowhere been suggested that she conceived and gave birth to Trasdasyu by sacrificial propitiation of abstract gods Indra and Varuna. The Ṛgveda and the Purāṇas both agree in giving Trasadasyu a human parentage. The Brahmāryan war-lords and leaders in the Ṛgvedic times were in the habit of taking beautiful Dāsīs (wives of Brahmāryan adversaries) as their wives or concubines. Widow Purukutsānī was also taken as such but by whom ? By Varuṇa or by Indra ?

Though Varuna had enjoyed superior powers and prestige to Indra in western Asia in the fourteenth Century B. C.; he had accepted subordination to Indra during the period of the Dāśarājña war in the twelfth century B. C., but he was still an important Brahmāryan leader. He was a bit morally and righteously inclined man. It appears that Indra, the immoral and voluptuous Brahmāryan war-lord, took Purukutsānī as his concubine with the blessings of Varuṇa. It was the physical union of Indra and Purukutsānī that gave birth to Trasadasyu, the posthumous levirate son of Purukutsa. As Trasadasyu was begotten for Purukutsa, he was known as Paurukutsa.[107] This conclusion is also otherwise corroborated by the internal evidence of the Ṛgveda. The Ṛgveda 4. 4. 10. 9. refers to Vṛtrahan qualities of Trasadasyu. Wilson on the authority of Sāyaṇa translates this ṛch. as "Slayer of foes, dwelling near the gods." This translation is erroneous. Trasadasyu has nowhere been given the epithet of 'Vṛtrahan.' Vṛtras were long ago annihilated under the leadership of Varuṇa in Iran and under the leadership of Indra in Bhārata. Even Varuna does not enjoy the epithet of Vṛtrahan in Bhārata. Trasadasyu became very famous in wars and victories that he was looked upon by the people as equal to Indra in prowess and glory. He was an Ardhadeva or Half-God like Indra.[108] Wilson agrees that, Indra is declared to be one half of gods.[109] Hence he cannot be called as a son of Varuṇa, but only that

107. A. C. Das; op. cit., page 354.

108. A. C. Das; op. cit., page 355.

109. H. H. Wilson, op. cit., page 367.

of Indra though with Varuna's blessings. In the Ṛgveda 4. 4. 10. 8. he is compared to Indra. He is "like Indra." He inherited the Vṛtrahan qualities of his father, the Indra. This refers to the physical prowess which he inherited from Indra, and which have been autosung by him elsewhere also. [110] This clearly establishes blood relationship of Trasadasyu with Indra and there remains no doubt that Trasadasyu was born to Purukutsānī, the widow of Purukutsa from Indra.

Kuruśravana, Levirate son of Trasadasyu from Mitrātithi

Trasadasyu was father of Trkṣi [111] and Kuruśravana is also given the fatherhood of Mitrātithi. [112] Mitrātithi, Mitra + Atithi = Guest-friend, was a Tṛtsu prince. It appears that his wife could not get a son from him and she begged of her husband to permit her to have a liverate son and Kuruśravana was born of the physical union of the wife of Mitrātithi and Trasadasyu, hence he is referred to as son of Mitrātithi also but Kuruśravana was better known as Trāsadasyava. Kuruśravana had a son Upamaśravas. The reference of Kuruśravana and his son Upamaśrvas appears only in the tenth Mandala of the Ṛgveda. [113]

The tenth Maṇḍala of the Ṛgveda is a later addition Atharvanic in character. [114] The existing collections of Atharvan belong to a very late period of Vedic productivity. They were the final product of a redactorial activity much later than that of the Ṛgveda. [115] The Rgvedic Brāhmanas do not mention Atharvaveda at all and the Śatapatha Brāhmana does not recognise it as a Veda. [116] It was redacted just a little earlier to the

110. Ṛgveda 4. 4. 10. 6.
111. Ṛgveda 8. 4 2. 7.
112. Ṛgveda 10. 3 4. 7.
113. Ṛgveda 10. 3. 3. 9, 10. 3. 4. 4
114. B. K. Ghose; Vedic Literature-General View (in Vedic Age); 1957; page 228.
115. M. Bloomfield, The Atharvaveda, 1899, page 2.
116. A. A. Macdonell; A history of Sanskrit Literature, 1958, page 190–191.

compositions of the Brāhmanas circa 750 B. C. It appears probable that the Atharvaveda alongwith other later Saṁhitās was redacted the circa 800–700 B.C.[117] The Ṛgveda depicts Brahmāryan culture of Brahmāvarta whose easternmost border was upto Hastināpura. The Rgveda was redacted circa 1000 B.C.[118] It must have taken the Brahmāryans at least 200 years to āryanise the eastern Bhārata upto Magadha and their presence in Madhyadeśa circa 800 B.C. seems quite certain. It appears therefore that the tenth Maṇḍala of the Rgveda was added to the already existing collection circa 800 B. C. The process of ethnic mixture had begun in full force after the Brahmāryan victory in the Dāśarājña war The Tṛtsus and the Bharatas had coalesced together. The historical fusion of the two tribes, the Bharatas and the Trtsus, after two generations from Purukutsa, gave sufficient strength and prestige to the newly developed hybrid tribe to establish its hegemony in the western Madhyadeśa Prince Kuruśravana proved a successful and victorious ruler and gave his own name to this hybrid tribe. Kuruśravana is the father and founder of the Kuru tribe.

Identity of Vedic Kuruśravana with Purāṇic Kuruśravaṇa unfounded

A. D Pusalker has tried to identify Kuruśravana of the Ṛgveda with Kuru-Samvarana of the Purānas and Mahābhārata.[119] He advances three arguments to prove his thesis. Firstly, that both came from the family of the Pūrus or the Kurus, the opponents of Sudās, secondly, that both belong to the Dāśarājña war, thirdly, that both are connected with Kavaṣa Ailūṣa as his patrons

Prince Samvarana, the alleged father of Kuru, according to the Purānas, belonged to the lunar Paurva family. The Purānas do-not mention the Pūru kings Purukutsa and Trasadasyu of

117. A. B. Keith; The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanisads, 1925; page 20.

118. (1) B. K. Ghose; op cit., page 225

(2) A S. Altekar; Presidental Address printed in Proceedings of Twenty-second Indian History Congress, page 100.

119. A. D. Pusalkar; Studies in Epics and Purāṇas 1955, page 43.

lunar Paurava family. The Ṛgveda several times mentions Purukutsa and Trasadasyu as Pūrus. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa mentions Purukutsa as Aikṣvāka.[120] Ikṣvāku, according to the Purāṇas belonged not the lunar line but to the solar line. The Ṛgveda mentions the ṛṣi Saṁvarana who was the seer of one Ṛgvedic Sūkta where Saṁvaraṇa mentions Paurukutsya Trasadasyu and two others as his patrons. This ṛṣi Samvaraṇa had absolutely no chance of being mixed up with Kuruśravaṇa or being mistaken for the other in the Vedic literature.[121] We do not come across any Samvarana, the Prince, in the Ṛgveda. Word Saṁvarana is not unknown to the Ṛgveda. The absence of Saṁvarṇa in the Ṛgveda negatives any theory that would connect him as the progenitor of the Kuru tribe.

The Purāṇas mention solar Aikṣvāka Purukutsa and Trasadasyu but do not connect them with Kuruśravana. Pusalkar concedes Trasadasyu the father-hood of solar Aikṣvāka Kuruśravaṇa. If lunar Paurava Kuru-Saṁvarana is equated with solar Aikṣvāka Kuruśravana, then solar Aiksvāka Trasadasyu, the father of Kuruśravana, and lunar Paurava Saṁvarana, the father of lunar Paurava Kuru-Sāmvarana, must be identified with each other that the Purānas and Pusalkar are not prepared to do. Even if they like to do that, that equation becomes impossible as the later is connected with the Dāśarājña war while the former is not so connected. Pūrus are not mentioned in the oldest Brāhmana's, the Pañchaviṁśa, the Aitareya and the Kauṣītaki. They are mentioned in the later Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa along with Pūru Purukutsa, but that only confirms a past memory. It appears that after the total or near-total fusion of the Pūrus with the Tṛtsus which began circa 1000 B. C., the Pūrus did not exist as an independent tribe and hence its memory as such was getting obliterated alongwith the passage of times We do not find any mention of the Pūrus as a tribe, kingdom, janapada or people in the Upaniṣads, Pānini or Patañjali. They were banished from history after sixth century B.C. The Purānas tried to resuscitate them, though in a perverted manner, after more than seven centuries.

120. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa; 13. 5. 4. 5.
121. A. D. Pusalkar; op. cit., page 45.

We find mention of the Iksvākus, the Kurus and the Bharatas in Pānini and Patañjali. Pānini mentions Ikṣvāku and Patañjali mentions Kuru and Ikṣvāku janapada which is obviously the same as Kośala janapada. [122] Pāṇini mentions Kuru gotra amongst both the Brāhmaṇas and the Kṣatriyas, Kuru janapada, in south-east of the Punjab contiguous to the Bhārata Janapada, Kuru kingdom having its capital at Hastināpura having a monarchical system of governance. [123] It appears that the republican system continued upto district level. Monarchy was established only at the central level in Patañjali's time. Chronology of Pānini and Patañjali respectively is generally placed at 450 and 150 B. C. [124]

Pānini and Patañjali both mention Bhārata territory and Bhārata janapada. [125] Pānini mentions them as an Āyudhajīvī Saṅgha of warrior people in the Kuru region on the border land of Udīchya (North) and Prāchya (East) divisions of India. [126] Mention of Bhārata as janapada clearly establishes that they preserved their identity and their republican form of Government till the times of Patañjali though largely decrepit in strength and glory.

Authors of Vedic Index maintain that since the Bharatas appear so prominently in the Brāhmaṇa texts as a great people of the past, while the later literature ignores them in its lists of nations, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that they became merged in some other tribe. They are of the view that the Tṛtsus, the Bhāratas and the Pūrus coalesced together to form the Kuru people. [127] In the light of above conclusions,

---

122. (1) V. S. Aggarwal; India as known to Pāṇini 1652, page 60.
(2) B N. Puri—India in the Time of Patañjali, 1957, page 80.
123. V S. Aggarwal, op. cit., page 37, 38. 54, 77, 425.
124. (1) V S. Aggarwal, op. cit., page 475.
(2) B. N. Puri; op. cit., page 7.
125. (1) V. S. Aggarwal; op. cit., page 37.
(2) B. N. Puri; op. cit., page 69.
126. V. S. Aggarwal; op. cit., page 451.
127. Macdonell & Keith; Vedic Index; Volume I. 1958; page 167.

the views of the learned scholars appear to be incorrect. They did not sufficiently pay attention to the late literature mentioned above which definitely mentions Bharatas as a people and a nation (janapadas may be so called). It may be that some of them may have joined this ethnic fusion.

The Brāhmanas, the Upaniṣads, Pāṇini and Patañjali do not mention any solar Kula or family and lunar Kula or family. Kula and Gotra are frequently mentioned in this literature. Words Sūrya and Chandra with other adjuncts, except the adjunct of Vaṁśa or Kula, also do appear in this literature This clearly shows that the Sūryavaṁśa and the Chandravaṁśa is only a Purāṇic fabrication

We find that the Iksvākus, the Bhāratas and the Kurus were independant tribes in the post-Vedic period. The unscientific and irrational inter-mixture of the Vedic and the Purāṇic personalities and tribes by Pusalkar has led him to impossible and irreconcilable situations It is hence definitely erroneous to assert that purāṇic Kuru-Sāmvarana and Vedic Kuruśravaṇa both belonged to the same Pūru or Kuru tribe

It is also not warranted by Vedic history to assert that both belonged to the Dāśarājña period. Ṛṣi Samvarana is contemporary of Trasadasyu who was definitely born after Brahmāryan victory in the Dāśarājña war. It must have taken him at least twenty five years to be young enough to claim a priest in ṛṣi Samvaraṇa. Kuruśravana was the son of Trasadasyu and could not, as A. D Pusalkar suggests, belong to the side of the Dāśarājña confederacy. He must have come of age at least after 50 years of the end of the Dāśarājña war. The Puraṇic Saṁvarana is alleged to have been defeated by the Pañchāla King Sudās whence he fled to Sindh and regained his lost kingdom—through Vasiṣṭha's help.[128] Pargiter equates this episode to the Ṛgvedic Dāśarājña war. The Rgveda knows only Purukutsa,[129] the Pūru, in the Dāśarājña war and none else of other heroes. Pusalkar owing to the contemporaneity

---

128. Mahābhārata (Cr. Ed.); 1. 89. 38-39.

129. Macdonell and Keith; Vedic Index; Volume I; 1958; p. 542.

of Kuruśravana and Kavaṣa Ailūṣa, has brought in Kuruśravaṇa, the grandson of Purukutsa, in relation to the Dāśarājña war. Even if we concede Sāṁvaraṇa in relation to the Dāśarājña war; we can not so relate his son Kuru-Sāṁvaraṇa. Saṁvaraṇa after regaining his lost kingdom arranged big sacrifices. He married Tapatī, the mother of Kuru after he regained his lost kingdom. Kuru was born[130] to her from Saṁvaraṇa after the alleged Dāśarājña war. It was impossible for unborn purānic Kuru-Sāmvarana to participate in this Dāśarājña war. No Purāna including the Mahābhārata maintains that Kuru, son of Saṁvarana participated in the Dāśarājña war with Sudās. Hence the alleged contemporaneity of Kuru-Sāṁvarana and Kuruśravana during the Dāśarājña war does not stand historical tests.

Was Kavasa Ailūsa the patron of both Kuru-Śravana and Kuru-Samvaraṇa? The great grandson of Samvarana, the purānic Janamejaya, was consecrated as a king by ṛṣi Tura Kāvaṣeya.[131] Kavasa Ailūṣa is the rsi of Sūkta 32 and 33 of the tenth Maṇḍala of the Rgveda. Here Kuruśravaṇa is referred to as still living. It proves the contemporaneity of Kavaṣa Ailūṣa and Kuruśravana. Kavaṣa was drowned in river Paruṣṇī naval battle in the Dāśarājña war. [132] He appears to be contemporary with Purukutsa. The Brāhmaṇas of the Ṛgveda[133] reproached Kavasa Ailūṣa as he was born of a female slave. Ilūṣā appears to be the wife of Kavasa; himself a Dāsa who fell in war at the hands of the Brahmāryans. The son of this Kavaṣa would have been contemporary of Trasadasyu and he might have effected compromise with the Tṛtsus. Though he was admitted to the Brahmāryan fold as a priest, he was still derided as the son of a slave woman (Dāsī) as her mother rightly was. As ṛsi Saṁvarana was contemporary to Trasadasyu; it appears reasonable to assume that ṛṣi Saṁvaraṇa

130. Mahābhārata (Cr. Ed.); 1. 163. 23; 1. 89. 41. 42.

131. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa; 7. 34; 8. 21.

132. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1. 12.

133. (1) Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 2. 19.

(2) Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa 12. 1. 3.

was priest of Trasadasyu and after his death; Kavaṣa Ailūṣa became his priest and after the death of Trasadasyu, he continued to be the priest of his son Kuruśravaṇa Tura Kāvaṣeya, the son of Kavaṣa Ailūṣa, thus becomes the contemporary of Upamaśravas, the son of Kuruśravana. A. D. Pusalkar, following the authority of Sāyaṇa, is clearly wrong in denying relationship of Trasadasyu with Upamaśravas. The statement of ṛṣi Kavaṣa Ailūṣa cannot lightly be brushed aside who definitely mentions Upamaśravas as son of Kuruśravaṇa Trāsadasyava. Ṛṣi Kavaṣa Ailūṣa enjoys an enviable status of eminence in the Brāhmanic literature. There is no doubt that Prince Upamaśravas was a real personality.

The Purāṇas and the Mahābhārata speak of Vasiṣṭha being purohita of Saṁvarana. We do not find any evidence in theVedic and the post-Vedic literature assigning Saṁvarana's priest-hood to Kavaṣa Ailūṣa or any other priest. Janamejaya is alleged to have Indrota Daivāpi Śaunaka as his priest according to the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa and Tura Kāvaṣeya according to Aitereya Brāhmana. But none of these Brāhmanas maintain that Janamejaya was grandson of Saṁvaraṇa or son of Kuru-Saṁvaraṇa. Kavaṣa Ailūṣa has also been mentioned in these Brāhmaṇas but nowhere in relation to any alleged Kuru. It is difficult to hold that Kavaṣa Ailūsa had Saṁvarana as his patron. He had Kuruśravana as his patron is self-evident from the Ṛgvedic evidence itself.

Pusalkar, to prove contemporaneity of Kuru-Saṁvaraṇa with the Dāśarājña war has equated Kavaṣa Ailūsa, the patron of Kuruśravana, with Kavaṣa who was drowned in Purusṇi during the Dāśarājña war. Tura Kavāseya was the priest of Janamejaya and as Tura Kāvaseya was the son of Kavaṣa Ailūṣa; the later had to be equated with Kavaṣa to give contemporaneity to his grand-father Kuru-Śaṁvaraṇa so that he may be brought in relation to the Dāśarājña war. Words Vṛddha and Śruta are proper names alongwith Kavaṣa in the Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1. 12. Even if we concede these two words meaning of 'Old and famous' qualifying Kavaṣa, that only indicates that Kavaṣa was held in high esteem by the Brahmāryan adversaries. We do not know from the Ṛgveda whether

Kavaṣa was a priest or not; but we definitely know him as a military hero. Kavaṣa Ailūṣa, though a son of a non-Āryan Dāsī, had transferred his allegiance from the Bhāratīyans to the Brahmāryans after Tṛtso-Pūru ethnic fusion had begun. He might have been hated as the son of Dāsī, still he was regarded as a great and famous ṛṣi. Kavaṣa, the Brahmāryan adversary, could not win their recognition. It appears certain that Kavaṣa and Kavaṣa Ailūṣa belong to different periods of history and they acted under different sets of social conditions. Kavaṣa and Kavaṣa Ailūṣa, though father and son, were definitely two different persons. Thus we find that Pusalkar is wrong in holding that Kavaṣa Ailūsa, the priest of Kuruśravaṇa, an enemy of Sudās, was thrown into waters by Indra. The person thrown into waters was the father of the priest of Trasadasyu and Kuruśravana both of whom did not exist during the Dāśarājña war. He has made confusion worse confounded by ignoring dialectical chronological history Kavasa Ailūṣa of Pusalkar died during the Dāśarājña war in old age and could not be the patron of the Ṛgvedic Kuruśravana. If he was patron of the purānic Saṁvaraṇa; then, his son Tura Kāvaṣeya could not continue so long as to be the patron of Kuru-Sāṁvarana, Parikṣit and Janamejaya. It is therefore impossible to prove the identity of Kuruśravaṇa by bringing in ṛsi Kavaṣa Ailūṣa.

Historicity of Parikṣit and Janamejaya

Kuru analysis would be incomplete without examining the historicity of Parikṣit and Janamejaya. They are problem persons in the Brahmanical literature. Both are not mentioned in the Ṛgveda. The Atharvaveda mentions a Kuru Rājan Parikṣit[134] but does not mention Janamejaya. This Atharvanic reference is in the twentieth book which is a late addition. The chronology of this book may be placed circa 700 B. C. We do not know the names of the father or son of Parikṣit. This Parikṣit has been accepted by Roy Chaudhary as a Kuru King.[135]

134. Atharvaveda 20. 127. 7–10.

135. H. C. Roychowdhari; Political History of Ancient India, 1950; page 12.

The word used in the Atharvanic hymns is 'Rājño' (राज्ञो) or 'Rājñaḥ' (राज्ञः). In the Atharvanic age, the whole people elected and re-elected the Rājan.[136] It appears that the Atharvanic Parikṣit was either an elected leader of the Brahmāryan people or he was a great sacrificer held in high esteem. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa makes this ambiguity clear. The priest recites the Pariksit verses, for Parikṣit is Agni, for Agni dwells around (Parikṣeti) these creatures, for round Agni these creatures dwell.[137] It appears that the word Pariksit came to be used as an apithet for a great sacrificer and hence he has been equated with Agni. Word Pariksit occurs only once in the Aitareya Brāhmana and that also in the sence of Agni or sacrificer. Hence the Atharvanic references appear to be in praise of a great sacrificer who might have been elected by the people or who might have claimed the universal respect of the people.

Word Pariksit is used several times in the Aitareya[138] and the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇas.[139] Pariksit means the son of Agni. Hence the word 'Pāriksita' is also used in the sense of a sacrificer. Janamejaya Pāriksita in the Aitareya and the Śatapatha does not mean Janamejaya, the son of Parikṣit but it only means Janamejaya, the Sacrificer. The Brhadāranyaka Upaniṣad bemoans the fading away of the Pārikṣitas.[140] It does not here bemoan a few descendants of a man named Parikṣit but bemoans the fading out of history of the by-gone sacrificers. This Upanisad was composed in the Madhyadeśa in 6th century B. C.[141] These were the times of Mahāvīra and the Buddha in Madhyadeśa who were very successful in organising opposition to the Brāhmanical bloody sacrifices

136. Atharvaveda, ". 4. 2; 6. 8. 7. 1.

137. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, 6. 32.

138. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 8. 11; 8. 21; 7. 27; 4; 7. 34.

139. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 13. 4. 4. 1; 13. 5. 4. 3, 4. 6. 3. 2.

140. S. Radhakrishanan, Principal Upaniṣads, 1953, Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniśad; 3. 3 1; pages 218–219.

141. (1) A. B. Keith, op. cit. (R. P. V. U.) page 20.

(2) Radhakrishnan; op. cit., page 22

and this gave the priest sufficient cause to bemoan the fading out of the bygone sacrifices. Thus I hold alongwith Roth and Bloomfield [142] that Parikṣit was not a human being till sixth century B. C. It was only an epithet for a great sacrificer. [143]

Janamejaya is definitely a human being. In the oldest Brāhmana, the Pañchavimśa, he is referred as only an Adhvaryu priest.[144] His martial activities are referred to in the Aitareya Brāhmana.[145] The Kaurvyas or the Kuru people appear in the Atharvaveda but do not appear in the Pañchavimśa and Aitareya Brāhmanas. Nowhere Janamejaya has been referred as Kuru nor the Kauravas are brought anywhere in relation to Janamejaya. The Pañchavimśa and the Aitareya Brāhmanas were composed circa 750 B C It is the later Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa that Janamejaya has been associated with the Kurus. The Śatapatha Brāhmana was composed Circa 600 B. C. [146]

It is significant that the Atharvaveda, the Pañchavimśa, the Aitareya and the Śatapatha Brāhmanas do not mention the name of the father of so called Pariksit. They also do not mention Samvarana, Kuru-Samvarana, Kuru-Śravana and Upamaśravas at all. Epic Arjuna and Abhimanyu also do not find any reference in these texts. We find only two solitary figures, one doubtful and one certain standing quite apart from each other having no relation with the Kurus for five centuries after the Dāśarājña war.

We have two purānic genealogies of Parikṣit and Janamejaya The first genealogy is Samvarana-Kuru-Pariksit-Janamejaya The second genealogy is Arjuna-Abhimanyu-Parikṣit-Janamejaya. The former is said to have belonged to the

142. Macdonell and Keith, Vedic Index, Vol. I page 493.

143. Macdonell and Keith; Vedic Index, Vol. II page 77-78.

144. W. Calland, Pañchavimśa Brāhmaṇa, 1931, 25. 15. 3; page 641.

145. A. B. Keith; op. cit., (A. B.), 4. 27 (page 217); 7. 27 (page 314), 8. 21 (Page 336)

146. A. A. Macdonell; op. cit. (MSL), page 202. He puts the chronology of the composition of Brāhmaṇas Circa 800-500 B. C. These dates have been inferred from his observations.

alleged Dāśarājña war and the later after it. The scholars hold divergent views regarding the historicity of one set or the other. Roy Chowdhary maintains that the later set existed and the former did not.[147] Pusalkar forcefully controverts this view and holds that the former set had existed but complains that the former set had been transferred[148] by traditions and inventions of stories in the legends of the Epics and the Purāṇas in a perverted manner paying scant heed to the truths of history.

Traditional Transferences and Transpositions

Who were the figures that were transferred by tradition and bardic stories to the later generations? I have earlier alluded to the Ṛgvedic rchs giving autobiography of Pūru Trasadasyu. The first six rchs of that Sūkta have twofold character. A. C. Das treats it as a colloquy between Indra and Varuna showing in result the supremacy of Indra over Varuna.[149] I agree with him. But apart from this, these rchs also narrate the further events of the auto-biography of Trasadasyu. He says, "I rule over all men and the whole Kṣatriya race. I have all the principal energies for the destruction of Asuras. I have inherited the greatness of both Indra and Varuna. I, the affluent Indra, have been selected by the warriors mounted (on horsebacks) as their commander in battle and with victorious prowess. I have raised up the dust. I had been exhilarated by the sacred songs during sacrifice."[150] This clearly shows that Trasadasyu, son of Indra for Purukutsa, was a great martial hero like Indra. His son Kuruśravana, the founder of the Kuru tribe, had a famous ṛṣi Kavaṣa Ailūsa as his priest and must have also been a great victor and a great sacrificer though we do not find details of the activities of this prince. Tura Kāvaṣeya, son of Kavaṣa Ailūsa, a greater and more important ṛṣi than

147. H. C. Roy Chowdhary; op. cit. (P. H. I. A.); page 18.

148. A. D. Pusalkar; op. cit. (S. E. P.); page 45.

149. A. C. Das; Ṛgvedic Culture, 1925, page 85.

150. Ṛgveda 4. 4. 10. 1. to 6.

his father, had as his patron also a great sacrificer. Upamaśravas was his contemporary and he cultivated intimate contacts with him during the priesthood of his father. If we read jointly the history of Trasadasyu, his son and grandson alongwith the history of their priests Kavaṣa Ailūṣa and Tura Kāvaṣeya; we can not resist the conclusion that they must have been the leaders of their age and they must have greatly consolidated the Brahmāryan power by military conquests and horse-sacrifices. Looking to the political and social activities of these high personages, it appears that they lived a sufficiently long life to enable them to accomplish all that. The Dāśarājña war was fought and lost circa 1100 B.C.[151] We may allow the reasonable period of 150 years to the three royal personages and the two priestly personages. It appears that they accomplished all that circa 1000 B. C.

When the Brahmāryans took to the brāhmanisation of the eastern Bhārata after 1000 B. C., the conventional date of the composition of the Ṛgveda, the Brahmāryan rhapsodits took with them their propaganda lores to influence the masses. The bardic propaganda poetry always makes her theme beautiful and attractive by the use of allegories and similies, rhetorics and other forms of figures of speech. The whole Brahmāryan life was centred around Agni and sacrifice. The great sacrificers were respected by all people. They dwell in the hearts of all. It appears quite plausible that the great deeds of the great sacrificers were sung by the rhapsodists as dwelling in the hearts of all the creatures. They thus began to be called Parikṣit. It appears that Ksatriya leaders who became famous for organising great sacrifices began to be called Parikṣits or Pārikisitas. If we read the above Atharvanic reference in this light, we better understand the truth contained in the epithet 'Rājño Parikṣitaḥ.'

Word 'Janamejaya' means one who is victorious throughout all his life since the time of his birth. Pūru Trasadasyu was such a prince. He might have been rhetorically called in

151. R. C. Jain; Previous Section.

the beginning a reputed prince who was never vanquished on the battle-field and who always annihilated Brahmāryan adversaries, the Dasyus or the Asuras in the battles. The rhapsodists might have given the title of Janamejaya to Trasadasyu and began to call him Trasadasyu the Janamejaya. History knows Alfred the Great, Akbar the Great, William the Conquerer, Gandhi the Mahātman, and Tagore the Gurudeva. Proper names Gandhi and Tagore might be forgotten some day and the tiles Mahātman and Gurudeva may live still longer even in this dreary prose age. Let history know one more great prince Trasadasyu the Janamejaya. Trasadasyu afterwards might have been consciously and purposely left out. But his title name Janamejaya continued. It seems that two groups of rhapsodists led by Indrota Daivāpi Śaunaka and Tura Kāvaseya sung the heroic deeds of Trasadasyu the Janamejaya. They ascribed to him two different horse-sacrifices officiated by one each of the two leaders or head-priests. This discrepancy in the Brāhmanical lore grows all the more numerous in later times when the great Epic was composed

The change in dropping out the name of Trasadasyu may also be traced to changes in social outlook brought out by the passage of advancing centuries. The hateful deeds of violence and immorality of Indra and Trasadasyu, not looked down as such in their age, might have begun to be looked down detestable four centuries later due to the reactions and inter-actions of the original spiritual culture of Bhārata on the materialist Brahmāryan way of life. That might have given cause to the popular singers to change the names and contents of persons, places and events to suit their needs in changed times.

Rsi Tura Kāvaṣeya was a very famous rsi of his age. According to the Ṛgvedic evidence, he happens in the age of Upamaśravas. Kavaṣa Ailūṣa was living during the latest period of the Ṛgvedic redaction circa 1000 B. C His son Tura Kāvaṣeya in the presence of his father might not have attained that fame and prestige which he later enjoys It may be possible that Kavaṣa Ailūṣa need not have mentioned his son Tura. But his mentioning of Upamaśravas is of very great

significance and it leads to the conclusion that during the end of this period; he had sufficient sacrifices to his credit to claim a place in such an important book. He must have been as great as his immediate predecessors. Tura Kāvaseya lent no small help to his greatness. It may also be possible that like his grandfather Trasadasyu; he also might have been known as Upamaśravas, the Janamejaya. He comes in the age of Janamejaya. His historicity is also impliedly conceded by the Purānas and the Mahābhārata. The post-Mahābhārata genealogy is Arjuna-Abhimanyu-Parikṣit-Janamejaya. The pre-Mahābhārata genealogy is Samvaraṇa-Kuru-Parikṣit-Janamejaya. The Rgvedic genealogy is Indra (Arjuna)-Trasadasyu-Kuruśravana-Upamaśravas. These genealogies point to respective equations.

Ahisthala

The capital of Janamejaya of the Mahābhārata and the Purānas is said to be Āsandīvat. The Aitereya and the Śatapatha Brāhmanas and Pāṇini corroborate this fact [152] He is also said to have conquered Taxila. [153] The location of Āsandīvat would give us a clue to the reignal boundaries of Janamejaya. Āsandīvat is equated with Ahisthala by Kāśikā.[154] Ahisthala means the capital of the Ahi people. It was Ahi race that the Ṛgvedic Brahmāryans annihilated. The Ahis were also called Nagnas or Nāgas. Hastināpura was also called Nāgapura, Nāgahva, Nāga-Sāhvaya, Gajapura, Gajāhva and Gaja-Sāhvaya[155] Janamejaya's capital was not named Hastināpura till the end of Janamejaya's rule. The Purānas ascribe the name of Hastināpura to one Hastin who, according to the Purāṇas was the predecessor of both the sets of the Purānic genealogies of Janamejaya. Hence the Purāṇic Hastin cannot be brought in relation to Hastināpura. Hastināpura is not at all mentioned in the Brāhmanas and the Upanisads and the Vedangas. Pāṇini mentions Hastināpura[156] and uses the word Hastin. He also gives word Nāga

152. (1) Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 8. 21.
(2) Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 13. 5. 4. 2.
153. H. C. Roy Chowdhari; op. cit. page 37.
154. V. S. Aggarwal; op. cit., page 71.
155. B. C. Law, Tribes in Ancient India; 1943; page 399.
156. Pāṇini 6. 2. 101 (Aggarwal—op. cit. page 54).

for Hastin meaning elephant.[157] In the Brāhmaṇas and the Upaniṣads, the word Hastin[158] and Nāga[159] both have been used. Hastin means an elephant. Word 'Nāga' sometimes has been given this meaning but meaning 'slave or serpant' suits better in the context. To enter into those details here would be an irrelevant digression. The Nāga people were very powerful. They had their elephant in war as the Brahmāryans had their horse. It appears that power and strength of the Nāga people and their association with elephant inspired Pāṇini to use the word Nāga for Hastin. Pāṇini does not know the word Gaja. It did not occur to him to change the name of Āsandīvat or Ahisthala into Nāgapura, Nāgahva, Nāga-Sāhvaya, Gajapura, Gajāhva and Gaja-Sāhvaya. The Mahābhāratic bards punned upon the word Nāga and armed with the authority of Pāṇini changed the name of Āsandīvant (Ahisthala) into Gajapura and Nāgapura circa 200 B.C. or after. We do not find the name Hastināpura used in pre-Pāṇinian literature.

It gives us a very important clue to our present enquiry. Janamejaya did not advance to the eastern Bhārata to brāhmanise it. He only consolidated the already won Brahmāryan power from Taxila to Hastināpura and laid the steel foundation of strong and famous Brahmāvarta. This is definitely the Ṛgvedic region called Brahmāvarta (territory spread over or covered by the Brahmas) though particularly the region of the Saraswatī, the Āpayā and the Dṛṣadvatī was the heart of it. Hence the person known as Janamejaya must be the Ṛgvedic person but the Ṛgveda does not mention him.

Upamaśravas Transferred as Janamejaya

Upamaśravas and Janamejaya, as just shown, belong to the same age. It appears that Upamaśravas was first transferred as Janamejaya the priest and afterwards with the

157. Pāṇini 2. 1. 62 (Aggarwal—op. cit., page 218).

158. (1) Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 3. 1. 3. 4; 14. 8. 15. 11; 14. 7. 1. 20.
(2) Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 4. 1; 6. 27.

159. (1) Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 8. 22.
(2) Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 8. 22.
(3) Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, 1. 3. 22.

addition of the martial feats of his grandfather developed into full fledged Janamejaya of the Aitareya and the Śatapatha fame. Thus the legendary Janamejaya was created to suit the rhapsodist's changed purposes in changed times. But there are no rare instances of such perverse and topsy-turvy changes in the Vedic events transferred to later times through ingenious legends and effective stories. No standards to keep the true names, true tribes, true qualities and true events in tact need be observed in propagandist literature and this principal was faithfully followed by the Brahmāryan bards. Facts of one event could be divided into two or three events and two, three or four events could be amalgamated into one. The Purānas stand a glaring example of such transferances of events, names and places by traditions and inventions of ingenious stories, as truly remarked by A. D Pusalkar. That appears certain in the case of Parikṣit and Janamejaya. They never existed in history. They are a pure fiction

But in spite of Pariksit and Janamejaya; the Kurus exist in history Trtso-Pūru prince Trasadasyu accellerated the process of ethnic mixture of the Brahmāryans, the Bharatas and the Pūrus. Kuruśravana gave the new tribe his own name. The Kuru tribe came in existance circa 1000 or 950 B. C.

CHAPTER IX

THE ORIGIN OF VARṆIC ETHNOLOGY

1. THE PROBLEM

We find territorial and ethnic groups in the Pre-Brahmāryan Bhārata before the Brahmāryan military invasions. But they were not the conservative and separatist hierarchical organisations. They were fluid and mobile groups only bound together by ideological one-ness, not by any superficial rules and regulations The Bharatas, the Pūrus, the Yadus, the Anus, the Vrtras, the Panis, the Iksvākus and a host of others were only ethnic and territorial groups They were collectively termed by the Brahma invaders as belonging to the Dāsa-Varṇa. Varna, during the Ṛgvedic age, indicated only the colour, the colour of the two mutually opposing groups; the Āryas and the Dasyus and the Dāsas. It had no reference to social hierarchical organisations of the Brahma and the Bhāratīya peoples The Brahmāryan invaders had no sort of hierarchical organisation. They were single Brahma and Brahma only. Really, one of the most significant features of the Brahma conquest and colonisation of Bhārata, from the point of view of social history of ancient Bhārata, may be regarded the coalescence of the two Varnas, the Āryan Varṇa and the Dāsa Varna, the bifurcation of the one coalesced Varna into two Varnas, the Ārya-Varṇa and the Śūdra-Varṇa, the bifurcation of the Ārya Varna into the Brāhmana Varna and the Kṣatriya-Varṇa and that of the Śūdra-Varna into the Śūdra-Varna and the Vaiśya-Varṇa; the later upgrading itself joined the Brāhmana Varṇa and the Kṣatriya-Varṇa to form the Traivarṇa of the Brāhmana, the Kṣatriya and the Vaiśya to the permanent and non-returnable historical exclusion of the Śūdra. Varna now becomes a sociological institution. This is a peculiar institution nowhere found amongst any people in any part of the world.

The Brāhmaṇas are terrestrial Devas. It means that the true lineal descendants of the Āryan Devas are the Brāhmaṇas. This is a concession. The original Brahmas were themselves

the Devas. When the Brāhmaṇa and the Brāhmaṇa class orginated; the original Devas were transferred to svarga; their place being usurped by the Brāhmaṇas in our world, at least in Bhārata. They are the only Devas. The Kṣatriyas and the Vaiśyas, much less the Śūdras, are not the Devas and also can never hope to be Devas. This clearly indicates that the non-Āryan converts who could not raise themselves to the status of the Brāhmaṇas remained the dissatisfied lot and could not forget their non-Āryan origin while the convert Brāhmaṇas soon forgot their non-Āryan origin. This is very important in the growth of the Varṇic ethnology.

2. THE ORIGIN OF BRĀHMAṆA CLASS

Unitary Brahman

When the Brahmāryans invaded Bhārata, they constituted a single race, the Brahma race. Theirs was the universal tribal collective; the colossus social machine, the Brahman. There were no functional divisions also. All the members of the Brahman discharged all the function of the society, ideological, military, social and economic. There might have been some groups originally known as Gaṇas but the groups did not indicate class or social divisions and distinctions. [1] The distinctive names signified some political or social functions or activities. The Aṅgirasas were individually known so for their discovery of Agni. The Bhṛgus became famous for having fathered Agni from waters. The Atharvans indicated non-Soma-drinking fire scientists. The Trtsus (Vasiṣṭhas) formed a distinct military group. But they all were indivisible parts of the Brahma society. The members constituting the Brahma society were also known as the Brahmas. The conquering Brahma militarists gave their ethnic name to their new-colonised land in Bhārata, the name of Brahmāvarta; the land covered by the Brahma people. The Brahma society remained unitary at least for some time after the conclusion of the Dāśarājña War circa 1100 B. C. This unitary nature of the Brahma society is fairly fresh even upto the Upaniṣadic age circa 600 B. C. [2]

1. R.C. Jain; The Most Ancient Āryan Society; 1964; Chapter VIII.
2. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, 1. 4 10.

Convert Brahmas

As has been noted earlier, when the Brahmāryans peacefully settled in the Brahmāvarta; they had to make peace with the original inhabitants of Bhārata. They forced conversions and enticed numerous groups to accept conversions The new people brought new ideas. There was no necessity now for the Yajña and the Brahman to continue their materialistic activities of exploitation and violence. They were now the masters of a rich and prosperous land. The mass scale conversions had brought to their fold many pre-Āryan priests,[3] a convenient word for spiritual leaders. Viśvāmitra and his fifty sons led the chain and many more joined. We have learnt earlier that the Kanvas, the Bharadvājas and many other Ṛṣis were drawn from the pre-Āryan Bhāratīya fold by the Brahma masters. The newly borrowed spiritual order forced the Brahmas to transform their institutions. The tribal activities gave way to more civilized activities. The institution of the Yajña began to be ritualised.

Origin of Brāhmaṇa

The convert Brahmas raised the status of the original Brahman. The Brahman united with the word "Ṇ" and became Brahmaṇa. "Ṇ" means knowledge [4] Knowledge is another name of Ātman or spirit. It is related with asceticism and spirituality. "Ṇ" means wisdom, [5] rather spiritual wisdom The pre-Āryan spiritual leaders of Bhārata followed the Śramaṇic way. [6] The Bhāratiyan converts had taken the Śramaṇic way to their new fold. The Brahmāryans had physically conquered Bhārata but they stood completely conquered by the Bhāratīya Śramanic way The Brahman became śramaṇised. The śramaṇised Brahman became the Brahmaṇa. The laurels to śramaṇise the Brahmas go to the Dasyu-chief Viśvāmitra.

3. D. D. Kośāmbi; Origin of Brāhmaṇa Gotras; J. B. B. R. A. S. Vol. 26 (N. S.), 1950; Page 29.
4. Monier-Williams; A Sanskrit-English Dictionary; 1956; p. 431.
5. H. D. Setha; Pāiasaddamahaṇṇavo; 1928; page 467.
6. R. C. Jain; The Most Ancient Āryan society, 1964; chapter I Section 6.

Viśvāmitra was the leader of the Dāśarājña confederacy but he along with his fifty sons (the rest fifty were driven to south and south east for not compromising with the Brahmas) made peace with the new victors and he was accepted by the victors with all glory and prestige. He could have been, as he proved to be, a very effective tool to strengthen the Brahmāryan hold on the newly vanquished peoples. He could be the right medium of understanding the customs, manners, ideas, institutions and the whole way of life of the Bhāratīyans. He became the Prathamjā Brahmana or the Foremost Brahmana in the coalesced society. He uttered the first prayer accompained by the oblation. [7] Viśvāmitra (himself the Ṛsi of sūkta 3. 2. 17) was the first discoverer of the oblationary Agni-cult. Soon after the poets emerged [8] and Soma extended them his protections. [9] The Brahmanas, thus, got protections of all the Soma-drinking Brahmāryan leaders; Indra, Agni, Bṛhaspati and others. The followers of the Brahmana-cult came to be known as the Brāhmanas. The word Brahmana is used nine times in the Rgveda out of which in five places it consistently stands for Brāhmanāḥ.[10]

Origin of Brāhmaṇa class

The word Brāhmaṇa has been used about 15 times in the Ṛgveda. In the beginning the Brāhmaṇas, like other Devas, are progenitors, presenters of Soma and extenders of the Yajña. The Brāhmanas had introduced the institution of penance in their society. The penance was non-existent in the Brahmic society. They uttered sacrificial storas very loud and offered Soma libations. [12] Mitra and Varuṇa accepted Soma from Brāhmaṇas. [13] Indra drinks Soma juice from the spacious

7. Ṛgveda 3. 2. 17. 15.
8. Ṛgveda 6. 2. 1. 30.
9. Ṛgveda 6. 5. 3. 3.
10. N.G. Chapekar; Brahma, Brahmaṇa, Brāhmaṇāḥ; A. B. O. R. I. Vol. XLI Page 59.
11. (1) Ṛgveda 6. 6. 4. 10.
(2) Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā (V S. M.); Vol. III page 259.
12. Ṛgveda 7. 6. 14. 1. 7. 8.
13. Ṛgveda 2. 4. 4. 5.

vase of the Brāhmaṇas. The Brāhmaṇas were the wiser men, the knowers of the Veda.[15] The Brāhmaṇas raise their status in the society by and by and they gain prominence in the age of the tenth Maṇḍala of the Ṛgveda circa 800 B. C. Now the Brāhmaṇa becomes identified with Bṛhaspati.[16] They became the masters of the ritual formule.[17] The Brāhmaṇa becomes the mouth of the Puruṣa.[18] He has now raised himself to the position of the chief spokesman of the whole society as he has by this time been acknowledged the mind and the head of the society. Though the Brāhmaṇas had gained social superiority, they are still a fluid social group They, in the Ṛgvedic age, are neither a solidified class, nor a member of the Varna system. Any member of society who could attain proficiency in Stotraism could be acknowledged as the Brāhmaṇa. The Brāhmaṇa functionaries had not yet been compartmentalised. The above description of the functions of a Brāhmana indicates that he was now choosing to adopt to himself certain special duties. In the former times, he socially performed, as a part of the social machine, all the functions of the society but it could not be so in the changed circumstances. Though the Yajña was still the centre of their activities; political, social and economic; its form has changed. The Yajñic activities had also become extensive The tribal Yajña became divided in political Yajñas, such as the Rājasūya and the Aśvamedha; social Yajñas such as Soma, Vājapeya and others and domestic Yajñas. The Brāhmana became the respository of all the intricate knowledge for the due fulfilment of these Yajñas. This ritualisation of the Yajña needed a special social group. This social necessity gave birth to the Brāhmaṇa class. The Brahman developed into the Brahmaṇa and the Brahmaṇa into the Brāhmana class. The origin of the Brāhmaṇa class disturbed the unitary Brahmic society. The rule of inequality

14. Ṛgveda 1. 4. 4. 5.
15. (1) Ṛgveda 1. 22. 8. 45.
(2) Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā (V. S. M.); Vol. I. page 1609.
16. Ṛgveda 10. 9 10. 4.
17. Ṛgveda 10. 6. 3. 8. 9; 10. 7. 4. 19; 10. 2. 7. 22.
18. Ṛgveda 10. 7. 6. 12.

set in. The burden of the existence of the Brāhmaṇa class fell on the rest of the society. The historical necessity of the Brahmic society created a Brāhmanic class.

3. THE ORIGIN OF KṢATRIYA CLASS

Social Impasse

The social impasse soon obstructed the progress of the newly evolved Brāhmaṇic society. Powerful leaders of the vanquished society had joined the new society. There emerged many powerful leaders in the original society also. The impact of the Bhāratīyan institutions of freedom, family and inheritance had penetrated the Brāhmanic society. The collective dictatorial power of the Gaṇapatis and the Brahmanaspatis began to fade. Individual chieftains with their private properties had arisen. The institution of the Yajña was ritualised to continue the collective Brāhmanic exploitation but that could not endure for long. It met stiff and strong opposition from those sections of the society who suffered the brunts of the Yajñic exploitation and also from those who could not win a share in the Yajñic loot. The assimilation of the original inhabitants of the land accelerated the process. This internal contradiction provided by the Kṣatriya (or Vṛtric) elements soon came to the fore. The victors had celebrated their triumph in distributing among themselves the spoils of the war. The gold, the land, the slaves went to the shares of the powerful leaders and their associates in the Brahmic society. Those who still wielded economic, political and social power in the vanquished society but allured to the new fold also asserted their supremacy. The collective tribal way began to disintegrate. The old and the new struggled for growth. The healthy elements of both evolved a new pattern, the pattern of Varṇic tribalism. The Ārya-Varṇa and the Dāsa-Varna of the Ṛgvedic fame now had coalesced together. The powerful elements of the newer mixed society imposed ruthless violence and exploitation over the masses. They devised the fraud of religious magico-ritualism. One section took upon itself to provide the intellectual base to the newer state and the other the duty of its protection. This tribal

loot and plunder was sought to be maintained by the re-allignment of the unity of the Brāhmanic society.

Rgvedic Kṣatra

The Kṣatra was not a separate function, a separate entity in Ṛgvedic times. The Kṣatra was also not a social group. Word Kṣatra and its derivatives have numerously been used in the Ṛgveda. Ksatra means physical prowess.[20] Kṣatra means wealth.[21] Kṣatra also means strong people.[22] Word Ksatra occurs in the Ṛgveda in close relationship with Indra, Agni, Varuna, Brahmanaspati, Mitra, Aśvins, and Dyaus-Prthvī. They themselves possess Ksatra, strength or wealth; and they also bestow Ksatra upon their favourites. The Kṣatra is only a quality, an attribute of the Brahmāryan Devas. The Brahmic Devas effectively wielded Ksatra, hence they are also called Ksatriyas. Ksatriya, in this context, means a power-wielder[23] Indra and Agni are such Kṣatriyas.[24] It is a very significant Ṛgvedic statement that attributes the quality of a Kṣatriya to Agni also Agni was a weapon with the Rgvedic Brahmāryans and he was also the wielder of fire missiles He actively took part in battles. He, therefore, rightly claims the epithet of a Kṣatriya from the Ṛgvedic ṛṣis It is only in the Atharvanic times circa 800 B. C. that Agni along with Bṛhaspati becomes associated with Brahman and Indra, along

19. R. C. Jain; op. cit. (M. A. A. S.); 1964; chapter 9 section 2.
20. Ṛgveda 1 6 1. 6, 1. 6. 2. 5; 1. 8. 5. 8, 1. 10. 4. 8, 1. 10. 4. 11; 1. 20. 3. 1; 1. 20. 3. 3, 1 22. 1. 2, 1. 22. 1 6; 1. 22. 4. 5; 1. 22. 6. 22; 4. 2. 7. 1, 4. 2. 11. 1; 5. 5 8. 6; 5. 5. 10. 2, 5. 5. 11. 1, 5 5. 12. 3; 6 3. 2. 8; 6. 5. 1. 3, 6. 6. 6 5. 6; 7. 2. 1. 25; 7. 3. 1. 11; 7. 4. 11. 11, 8 3. 7. 33; 8. 5. 7. 7; 8 5. 7. 7; 10. 2. 2. 9; 10. 4. 18. 5; 10. 12. 29. 3.
21. Ṛgveda 1. 16. 8. 6; 3. 3. 9. 3; 3. 3. 9. 5; 5. 2. 13. 7, 5. 5. 6 6; 4. 1. 4. 8; 6. 1. 8. 6; 7. 2. 11. 3; 8. 4. 2. 7.
22. Ṛgveda 8. 5. 5. 17.
23. Ṛgveda 8. 4. 5. 8; 10. 5. 6. 8.
24. Ṛgveda 4. 2. 2. 3, 5. 5. 13. 1; 7. 4. 9. 2.

with Āditya, with Kṣatra. Kṣatra, hence, in the Ṛgvedic age, denotes only the military and economic power of the undivided Brahman. It has not yet become an ethnological epithet.

Non-Āryan Kṣatriyas

The word Asura has also been used in the sense of physical prowess in the Ṛgveda. The Brahmāryan Devas are Asuras. The word Asura has been used in the Rgveda for more than 115 times and about 100 times it has been used in good sense. Indra, Agni, Varuna and other Devas are all Asuras. The word Asura has nowhere been used in relation to the Brahmāryan adversaries the Vrtras, the Rakṣas, the Paṇis, the Dāsas, the Dasyus and other in the Ṛgveda. Vṛtrāsura, Śambarāsura, Varchināsura and other such Asuras are only the epic and the Purāṇic fabrications. This epithet Asura stands in contradistinction to the word Kṣatra in the Ṛgveda. Asura, in the Rgveda, indicates the strength of the Devas and Kṣatra, the destructive power of their adversaries. The vigour of Indra is called Asura which is superior to Ksatra of his adversaries [25] Asura power here implies construstive power and Ksatra power, the destructive power.[26] The destrutive power of Indra has at one place also been alluded as the Ksatra.[27] The Brahma Ṛṣi Vasiṣṭha associates Kṣatriya with Rākṣasas. Soma instigates not the Kṣatriya dealing in falsehood. He instigates not the wicked. He destroyes the speaker of untruth. He destroys the Rākṣasa. Both remain in the bondage of Indra. The Rākṣasa says that he himself is pure and calls me (Vasiṣṭha) a Yātudhāna. [28] The Atharvaveda also re-echoes these statements of Vasiṣṭha. [29] These events echo the rivalry between Vasiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra. Viśvāmitra called Vasiṣṭha, and truly, a magician. He knew his Śramaṇic way as pure.

---

25. R. C. Jain, The Most Ancient Āryan Society; 1964, Chapter IV section 2.

26. (1) Ṛgvedn 7. 2. 4. 7.

(2) Ṛgveda-Samhitā (V. S. M.), Vol. III. page 321.

27. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 13 1.

28. Ṛgveda 7. 6. 15. 13–16.

29. Atharvaveda; 8. 4. 1"–16.

Vasistha denounces this Kṣatriya and wills his death through Agni Brāhmana is a speaker of truth and Kṣatriya is a speaker of untruth. These important ṛcs further reveal that the Ksatriya and the Rāksasa were forced to Indra's bondage. Ksatriya is an ethnological epithet here. Rākṣasas were an ethnological group. The bondage of Kṣatriya with Rākṣasa proves him also to be of an ethnological group. The word Ksatra or Kṣatriya has so far appeared only as a qualifying epithet. It is only here that it occurs for the first time in the ethnological sense. The Ksatriya group stands in rivalry to the Brāhmana group. This clearly indicates the avaidic and ayājñic character of the original Ksatriyas, who included the Vaiśyas and Śūdras amongst them also.[30] The original Ksatriyas, thus, appear to be pre-Āryan non-Āryan Bhāratīya people.

Meaning of Kṣatra

The members of the unitary Brahma society were known as the Brahmas The Brahma victors in their migratory stages were not attached to any particular dominion. The Brahma society in its earlier stages had assimilated in itself several influential elements of their conquered lands. These indigenous elements were the dwellers of lands. The word Kṣatra may be traced to √ksi, "to dwell" with "tra" suffix in the sense of "protective."[31] The indigenous inhabitants of the land whose duty was to protect the people of the land began to be called Ksatra. The word Kṣatra was coined or elevated, from being qualifying epithet, to connote a distinct group that became a part of the unitary Brahma society during the process of coalescence. The Ksatras, like Viśvāmitra, became brāhmaised. Kṣatra, in the new Brahmic context, meant the original powerful leaders of Bhārata, spiritual like Viśvāmitra or temporal like Balbūtha.

The Great Coalescence

It appears that after the conclusion of the Dāśarājña war, the convert spiritual and political leaders were harmoniously

30 Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 7. 19.

31. Monier Williams, op. cit., pages 325, 457.

assimilated in the Brahmic society. Viśvāmitra, one time Kṣatriya rival of Brahmic Vaśiṣṭha, was accepted with honours in the Brahmic hierarchy. The Bharata and Pūru Kṣatriyas had coalesced with the Tṛtsus to form the Kuru tribe. Trasadasyu, the levirate son of Purukutsa, the Pūru, upon Narmadā, the Purukutśānī, widow of Purukutsa, from Indra, accelerated the process of the ethnic mixture of the Brahmāryans and the Pūrus. Trasadasyu ruled over the whole Kṣatriya race. Several Ksatriya leaders organised great Yajñas and became famous as Parikṣits or Pārikṣitas.[32] It appears that Brāhmaṇic society was a homogenous unitary society till the final redaction of the Ṛgveda circa 1000 B. C.

Borrowing of Śramanic Culture

The story of the causes that led to this homogeneity of the diverse Āryan and non-Āryan elements is narrated in a Śatapatha Brāhmana parable. A cake on twelve potsherds is prepared for Indra and Viṣṇu in the Rājasūya. The reason of this is given like this. Of old, everything here was within Vṛtra, to wit, the Ṛc, the Yajus, and the Sāman. Indra wished to hurl the thunderbolt at him. Indra said to Viṣṇu, "I will hurl the thunderbolt at Vṛtra, stand thou by me"—"So be it;" said Visṇu, "I will stand by thee hurl it;" Indra aimed the thunderbolt at him. Vṛtra was afraid of the raised thunderbolt. Vṛtra said, "There is here a source of strenth I will give that upto thee; but do not smite me ." and gave up to him the Yajus formulae. Indra aimed at him a second time. Vṛtra said, "There is here a source of strength . I will give that upto thee, but do not smite me;" and gave upto him the Ṛc verses. He aimed at him a third time. Vṛtra said, "There is here a source of strength : I will give that upto thee; but do not smite me;" and gave up to him the Sāman hymns. Indra tore the Vṛtra's seat, his retreat, that he shattered,

---

32. (1) R. C. Jain, Origin of the Kuru Tribe, Jain Bharati; 2020 S. Y. pages 4, 9.

(2) Ṛgveda 4. 4. 10. 1.

grasping it and tearing it out.[33] The inherent potentialities of these verses are very great. Vrtras were highly cultured, greatly civilized and very learned people. They were the masters of sciences and humanities. Indra subdued the Vrtras by physical power. Vṛtras had surrendered to him afraid of total annihilation. Indra looted their country, their power, their wealth and their material happiness but it was beyond the power of Indra to understand their culture, art, philosophy and ideology. He, hence, sought the aid of Visnu, a lover of art, peace and philosophy, to learn the Vṛtra ideology The Vṛtras, out of fear, imparted their secret knowledge to their new masters. The Vrtras were the Śramanic people inhabiting the Śramanic region of Bhārata following the Śramanic ideology. This Śramanic ideology was borrowed by the Brahmāryans from their Bhāratīyan adversaries through the physical power of Indra and the intellectual power of Visnu. How was it effected ? The Śatapatha Brāhmana narrates a second parable to explain this process.

Viṣnu is yajña.[34] He who is consecrated indeed becomes both Visnu and a Yajñic. The gods had the Mind and the Asuras the Vāk. The gods said to yajña "That Vāk (Speech) is a woman : backon her and she will certainly call thee to her." Or it may be, he (yajña) himself thought, "That Vāk is a woman. I will beckon her and she will certainly call me to her." He beckoned her and she called him to her. The gods reflected, "That Vāk being a woman, we must take care lest she should allure him." The gods then cut her off from the Asuras and having gained possession of her and enveloped her completely in fire, they offered her up as a holocaust, it being an offering of the gods. The Asuras being deprived of speech, were undone, crying, "He lavaḥ; He lavaḥ." According to Sāyana, "He lavo" stands for 'he rayo' (i.e. ho;

33. (1) Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 5. 5. 5. 1-6.
(2) J Eggling; Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, 1963; Part III. p. 138-139.

34. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 5. 2 3. 6.

the spiteful) enemies.[35] The story, bereft of allegories, becomes very simple. Yajña was the military, social and economic tribal activity of the Brahmāryans. It was only Mind. It was not Wisdom. It needed the cooperation of Wisdom which was not with them. They took it from their adversaries. But how did they use this Wisdom, is the subject of the third parable.

Ritualisation of Yajña

The Yajña (Viṣṇu) lusted after Vāk, the unintelligible Mlechchha speech, thinking, "May I pair with her." He united with her. Indra then thought within himself, "surely a great *Monster* will spring from this union of Yajña and Vāk. (I musttake care) lest it should get the better of me." Indra himself then became an embryo and entered into the union. Now when he was born after a year's time, he thought within himself, "Verily of great vigour is this womb which has contained me (I must take care) that no greater (***Monster***) shall be born from it after me, lest it should get the better of me." Having seized and pressed it tightly, he tore it off and put it on the head of the Yajña (Viṣnu).[36] This womb was the seat, the retreat of Vṛtra as alluded to earlier. Here completes the story of the ritualisation of yajña. Viṣṇu brought the Śramaṇic knowledge to his fold. If that knowledge would have been accepted in pristine purity as given by Vṛtra and learnt by Viṣnu; the course of history of Bhārata would have been otherwise. But Indra could not and did not permit that. He and his victor society could not accept the pure śramaṇic ideology. They had to keep their Brahmic base in tact. Indra tore off the seat where Vṛtra resided and being himself there; tore it off for all times. The Brahmic base of yajña was to remain in tact in the Vāk-ised or the śramaṇised yajña. That base is exploitation and violence as Indra represents exploitation and violence of the Brahma society.

---

35. (1) Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa; 3. 2. 1. 17–23.
(2) J. Eggling; op. cit. Part II p. 29–31 & Note 3 on p. 31.

36 (1) Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 3. 2. 1. 24–28.
(2) J. Eggling; op. cit, Part II page 32.

The Vṛtras imparted their adversaries the knowledge, the wisdom of the arts of advanced agriculture, industry and social sciences. Their military masters learnt from them the science of peace and freedom. The Vṛtras also imparted them the revolutionary wisdom, so far unknown to the materialistic Āryans, of the ever-growing progress of the human society. They learnt for the first time that there is some permanent substance known as the Ātman. It attains blissful abode by good deeds and gloomy abode by deeds of violence. The man has to live in a civil state with his fellow brother. It is penance, renunciation that awards blissful state. Vṛtras, in substance, taught their new masters the science of Śramaṇalogy; the existence of soul, its transmigrations, good and bad future life, penance and the fundamental five tenets of Non-violence, Truth, Non-stealing, Continance and Non-attachment. But the new masters could not digest the śramaṇic ideology in fullness. They appreciated most the idea of the ever-growing progess of man and attainment of blissful state the svarga, by him. They borrowed these ideas and applied them to their institution of yajña. They knew the efficacy of material possessions and hence they accepted the idea of renouncing a part of their material possessions for bountiful pleasures in svarga. They made yajña the vehicle for svarga. Viṣṇu and through him the Brāhmanic society, by accepting śramanic ideas though in a perverted form, gave the naked exploitative Yajña a civilized form. The oblation of material objects, accompained with chanting of stotra, in main the magical formulae, became the driving social force of the new Brāhmaṇic society. The contacts with the culture and ideas of the Brahmāryan adversaries necessitated the ritualisation of Yajña.

Homodeitheism

The ritualisation of yajña led to another important phenomenon. Trasadasyu, of mixed Āryan and non-Āryan blood, had assumed the status of Indra. He established for himself a position equal to Indra.[37] The non-Āryan constitutions of

37. Ṛgveda 4. 4. 10. 8. 8.

the Brāhmaṇic society were coming to their own. The social atmosphere of the Brāhmanic society had largely changed and was still changing. The hateful deeds of violence, cruelty, murders, exploitation and frauds of Indra and other Brahma leaders had begun to be looked down contemptuously. This hierarchy had to be given a glorious burial. There was a time when the Āryan leaders needed the vitality and energy of the forces of nature. The forces of nature were made to descend for them. The time now has come for the Āryan leaders to ascend to the forces of nature. Indra, Agni, Varuna Rudra and others were ceremoniously sputniked to heaven. The vestiges of their human existence were sought to be obliterated I have previously termed the theory of descent as the theory of Morphomotheism I term this theory of ascent, the theory of Homodeitheism. Real man becomes an ephemeral deity The Gaṇapatis and Brahmaṇaspatis of the human race became Ganapatis and Brahmaṇaspatis of the unreal, unknown world, the svarga. The Brāhmanic ideology, here, completes with the ritualisation of the Yajña and celestialisation of the Brahma leaders

Ascendancy of Dark-skinned Brāhmaṇas

The Bhāratīyan intellectual leaders, it appears, that joined the Brahmic society, soon became very influential in the society. These dark-skinned Bhāratīya Brāhmaṇas, who came from the un-Āryan stock of Dasyu-Vṛtras were cleverer and more intelligent than the white skinned ones.[38] These are the spiritual leaders whom Stuart Piggot conjectures as the priesthood of some religion that were the potent forces behind Harappa organisation and who played a very important part in the regulation of Harappa economy.[39] These are the spiritual leaders of Indus civilization whom Sir Mortimor Wheeler could not identify but who, he thinks, transmitted to its successors a metaphysics. These śramaṇic metaphysicians soon triumphed over the materiatic culture that

38. Buddhaprakash; Vṛtra A.B.O.R.I. Vol. XXX pages 193–194.
39. Stuart Piggot; Pre-historic India; 1950; page 201.

had physically subjugated them.[40] This situation could not be to the liking of the new masters.

Yajña-Agent

The Indras and the Vṛtras, the Brahmas and the Kṣatriyas could not keep the unity of the Brāhmaṇic society in tact for a long time. The ascendancy of the Kṣatriyas was envied by the Brāhmaṇas in the mixed society. Kṣatrya Brāhmaṇas faired better than the Brahma Brāhmanas in the mixed society. The powarful Kṣatriya section became more dominating. The Kṣatriyas began to oppress the Brāhmaṇas and snatch away their cattle.[41] The Ksatriya Brāhmaṇas began to monopolise the yajñic activities.[42] The powerful Kuru tribe, with predominance of Bhāratīya Pūrus and Bharatas, along with Tṛtsus was formed circa 950 B. C Soon after Janamejaya flourished in the ninth century B. C.[43] Janamejaya was a great conqueror. He performed a horse-sacrifice with Turā-Kāvaseya as his priest.[44] Turā Kāvaseya was son of Kavasa Ailūṣa. This Kavaṣa Ailūṣa was derided by the Brāhmana Ṛṣis as the child of a slave woman, a cheat, no Brāhmana,[45] with whom the Brāhmanas will not eat[46] Such non-Āryan priest could not be tolerated by the Brahma priests. Janamejaya, himself a Kṣatriya, though of mixed blood, being a descendant of Trasadasyu, patronised the convert priests and that flared up the hostility of the Brahma priests. They opposed him under the leadership of Vaiśampāyana, a Bhārgava.[47] This

---

40. Sir Mortimer Wheeler, The Indus Civilization; 1953; page 93
41. Atharvaveda 12. 5 5, 12. 5 45-46
42. R. C. Jain op. cit. (O K. T.), page 11.
43. H. C. Roychowdhari, Political History of Ancient India, 1950; page 36
44. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 8. 21.
45. (1) Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 2. 19
(2) A. B. Keith; Ṛgveda Brāhmaṇa; 1920; page 148.
46. (1) Kauṣītaki Brāhmana 12. 3.
(2) A B. Keith; op cit. page 414.
47. (1) H. C. Roy Chowdhari; op. cit. page 38-39.
(2) F. E. Pargiter; op. cit. (A. I. H. T.); page 192.

historical event suggests the coming into being of a new office; an independant office of the priest, a medium of sacrifice and his deity. Upto this time, the sacrificer himself conducted the sacrifice. There was no agent of sacrifice. In the Ṛgvedic age, Vasiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra sacrificed for themselves, not for any other king. Trasadasyu sacrificed for himself for getting progeny but he had no priestly agent.[48] We do not find the priestly agency of Yajña in the Ṛgveda. It is only in the nineth century B. C. that we find the office of the priest who sacrificed, not for himself, but for somebody else, a prince or a householder. The creation of the office of the Yajña-agent and usurpation of this office mainly by the erstwhile non-Āryan converts led to the disruption of the unitary Brahma society.

Origin of Kṣatriya Class

In this family struggle, the Brāhmana came victorious. The Ksatriya sacrificers lost the right of sacrificing for themselves They could sacrifice only through the agency of the Brāhmana priest. They lost the Yajña. They could only claim the fruits of the Yajña through the agency of the priest. This revolutionary change has been mythologically recorded in a Śatapatha Brāhmana parable which goes like this. Indra was thus moving on (in pursuit of Vṛtra), he addressed Agni and Soma, "Ye belong to me and I belong to you. That one is nothing to you. Why then do ye support that Dasyu against me ? Come over to me." And for reward and consideration, they went over to him and after them went forth all the gods, all the sciences, all glory, all nourishment, all prosperity. Indra, then, cut Vṛtra in twain.[49] Shorn off the gloss, the story becomes simple and intelligible. We may equate Indra with Brahman and Vṛtra with Kṣatra as we well know that Indra-Vṛtra dichotomy was later transformed into

---

48. Pañchaviṁśa Brāhmana; 25. 16.

49. (1) Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa; 1. 6. 3. 13–17.

(2) J. Eggling; op. cit., Part 1 Pages 166–167.

the Kṣatriya-Brāhmaṇa antagonism [50] or the Kṣatriya- Brāhmana antagonism was glossed over as the Indra-Vṛtra dichotomy. The Kṣatriyas lost the right of performing yajñas themselves where they could profusely drink Soma. Agni went to those whom it belonged; the Brāhmaṇas. The Kṣatriyas lost all glory, prosperity and nourishment won through the yajñas. Now these material boons became the exclusive Brāhmaṇa privileges. It is for this reason that Janamejaya denounces the priests who fling the sacrificer into a pit; like outcasts, robbers and evil-doers; who run away seizing the wealth of the sacrificer. [51] But the Brāhmanas and the Ksatriyas, both apprehending severe danger due to mutual disharmony, soon made up. The Brāhmanas accepted Janamejaya and consequently all the Ksatriyas superior to themselves and seated them foremost, themselves sitting below the Kṣatriya during sacrificial ceremonials. The Kṣatriyas assured Brāhmanas not to injure them, their own source of power The memory of this state of affairs is preserved in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad of the Śatapatha Brāhmana, a Brāhmana of Śukla Yajurveda. Brahman, in the beginning was only one. That, being one, did not flourish, He created further an excellent form, the Kṣatra power. Indra, Varuṇa, Soma, Rudra, Parajanya, Yama, Mṛtyu and Iśāna are Ksatras. Brahman created Kṣatra superior to himself and himself accepted his subordination. He acclaimed that nothing is higher than Kṣatra. [52] The Kṣatriyas have now won superiority and suzerainty over the Brāhmanas. They having celebrated the triumph of their ideology over the Brahmic ideology now celebrate the tirumph of their physical power. Of course, they now extended their full physical protection to their new subordinates, the Brāhmaṇas who extended to the new masters their full ideological support. Janamejaya, in return,

---

50. Buddhaprakash; Bhāratīya Vidya; Vol. XVIII (1958); page 41.
51. (1) Aitareya Brāhmaṇa; 8. 11.
 (2) A. B. Keith; op. cit. (R. B.); page 328.
52. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad; 1. 4. 11.

celebrated a horse sacrifice with Indrota Daivāpi Śaunaka,[53] a Bhārgava Brāhmaṇa as his priest.[54] Afterwards, we find Kṣatriyas and Brāhmaṇas eulogising each other. The unitary Brahma society has become twained. The Brahman and the Kṣatra have come to stay independantly. It was in the ninth century B. C. that the unitary Brahman faced the great social impasse. It could not flourish. The Kṣatra was created out of the Brahman, i.e. the unitary Brāhmaṇa society became divided into the Brāhmaṇa and the Kṣatriya classes The post-Janamejaya literature records this division of the unitary Brahma society in Brahman and Kṣatra. Brahman and Ksatra, as noted earlier, become separated in the Atharvanic age. Agni, the Rgvedic Ksatriya, has become Atharvanic Brahman. Indra is an Atharvaṇic Kṣatriya. The Brāhmaṇa accepted the supremacy of the Ksatriya and he agreed to protect his origin, the Brāhmaṇa. Kṣatriya stands in full glory, power and prestige in the Atharvanic age and after, an unemployed Brāhmana seeks monetary boons from a Kṣatriya prince in reward of the performance of the sacrifice for a long life to him in heaven.[55] The Brāhmana has begun to strengthen the arms and lustre of the Kṣatriya.[56] Kṣatriya has now become entitled to radiance.[57] We now notice perfect peace and harmony between the two warring sections of the unitary Brāhmaṇa society for common aggrandisement and common exploitation of the common peoples.

Brāhmaṇa and Kṣatriya Gotras

The Brāhmanas, to make the fusion of Brāhmaṇas and the Kṣatriyas real, further invented the device of creating identical gotras for both the constituents of the Brāhmaṇic society. The word gotra and its derivatives have been used in the Ṛgveda

53. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa; 13. 5. 4. 1.
54. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit. (A. I. H. T.); page 192.
55. Atharvaveda; 7. 103. 1.
56. Śukla Yajurveda; 9. 10; 40. 4; 11. 82; 30. 5.
57. Taittirīya Saṁhitā; 1. 8. 11. 1.

in the sense of an animal stall or herds of animals.[58] The use of the word Viśvagotryāḥ, in the sense of, "belonging to all the gotras," according to John Brough, in the sense of clans,[59] in an Atharvaṇic reference,[60] does not appear to be correct. The war-drum in the battle is addressed as Viśvagotryāḥ. It refers to the event of the Gana or Brahma tribal collective as a unit going to the battle-field. The word Gana, in its origin, applied to the herd of cattle and later came to be applied to the peoples.[61] Similarly, the word of gotra which applied to the herd of animals came to be applied to the people who owned these animal herds. The word, in this Atharvaṇic reference, is not used in the sense of clan but only figuratively, in the sense of all the people marching to the battle-front. The word gotra, in the sense of clan, became quite frequent in the Brāhmana period circa 600 B. C The pure Brāhmanas traced their origins to the Ṛgvedic Ṛsis Angiras, Bhṛgu, Marīchi, Atri, Vasiṣṭha, Pulaha, Pulastya and Kratu who are considered original gotra-kāras. The last three did not produce true Brāhmaṇa stock.[62] Anukramaṇic Saptarṣis are . Bharadvāja, Kaśyapa, Gotama, Atri, Viśvāmitra, Jamadagni and Vasiṣṭha.[63] The gotra-founder Ṛṣis are . Jamadagni, Bharadvāja, Gotama, Kaśyapa, Vasistha, Agastya and Atri.[64] Agastya is only a later Purāṇic intruder. He is the real brother of Vasiṣṭha, born of the joint semen of Mitra-Varuna from Urvaśī; and

---

58. Ṛgveda 1. 10. 1 3; 2 2. 6 1; 2. 3. 1-3-18-21; 3. 3. 1. 21; 3. 4 5 7, 4. 2. 6. 8, 6. 2. 2 2, 6 6. 4. 5, 3 4. 1. 4, 8 7 4. 5, 9. 5 1. 23; 10. 4. 6. 2; 10 9. 4 6-7; 10. 10. 8. 8.
59. John Brough, The Early Brāhmaṇical Gotra and Pravara; 1953; page 25.
60. Atharvaveda; 5 21. 3.
61. R. C. Jain; op. cit (M. A. A S.); 1964, Chapter IV.
62. A. D. Pusalkar; Traditional History from the Earliest Times (in Vedic Age) 1957; page 276.
63. C. V. Vaidya; Gotra and Pravāra; Proceedings of All India Oriental conference; First Session (Poona), page 34.
64. D D. Keshambi; Origin of Brāhmaṇa Gotras; A. B. O. R. I. Vol. XXVI page 23.

may safely be included in Vasiṣṭha. Gotama replaces here Aṅgiras. The others are non-Āryan Ṛṣis. Aṅgiras, Bhṛgu, Kaśyapa and Vasiṣṭha appear in all the lists. The Mahābhārata significantly maintains that there were only four original gotras; Aṅgiras, Bhṛgu, Vasiṣṭha and Kaśyapa. The other gotras became renowned later on account of the great deeds of their founder Maharṣis.[65] Kaśyapa belonged to the non-Āryan black-skinned stock. Bhṛgus also were not pure Brāhmanas. They had some non-Āryan blood in their veins though they may primarily be classed as Brāhmanas. Aṅgiras and Vasiṣṭha were the pure original Brahmarsis. The rest of the gotra ṛṣis are non-Āryans. Thus we find that the Brahma and the Kṣatra Ṛsis who became Brāhmanas were the founders of the Brāhmana gotras. The Ksatriyas had no gotras of their own. Their gotra and Pravara was the gotra and Pravara of their Purohitas.[66] As the gotras included both the Brāhmana and Ksatriya progenitors, no necessity was felt for separate gotras of each. The gotra of the Brāhmana purohita and the Ksatriya yajamāna came to be treated identical. The Brāhmaṇa-Kṣatriya historical unity, thus, was laid on the strong and secure foundations.

This is the history of the origin of the Kṣatriya class from the unitary Brāhmaṇa class. The Brahma class twained itself into the Brahman and the Kṣatra so that they jointly may efficiently keep up their supremacy and suzerainty over the masses for material benefits. This great event also proves the disintegration of unitary tribal collective under the impelling forces of human freedom where it now admits the new forces to the share of its collective loot and plunder under mutual arrangements.

4. THE ORIGIN OF VAIS'YA CLASS

Viś

Yāska has not etymolised the word Vaiśya. The word Vaiśya may be traced to √viś, to "enter or settle." Vaiśya

65. Mahābhārata (Cr. Ed.) 12. 285. 17–18.

66. John Brough; op. cit., page 195–196 Gotra-Pravara-Mañjarī page 126–127.

is the man of the soil, of the land. The word Vaiśya denotes the inhabitant of a territorial unit. The earliest derivation of the word from the √Viś is the word Viśaya in the sense of the peoples.[67] The word Vaiśya is later than the word Viśaya. The word Vaiśya appears to be a development upon the word Viśaya. The word Viś and its derivatives have amply been used in the Ṛgveda but Yāska has also not etymolised this word. He gives the word Viśpati[68] in the sense of the lord of the universe, lords of all and the lord of the house.[69] Yāska analyses it as Viśaḥ + Patim, "All-protector.[70] Sāyaṇa renders it as the protector of the subjects.[71] The first two interpretations of Yāska betray the burden of his age. They may signify Viśvapati, not Viśpati His third interpretation is nearer truth The word Viśpati is used in the tenth Maṇḍala of the Ṛgveda[72] composed and added to the main body circa 800 B. C. It appears that the word Viś in the sense of a house, a settlement, a grāma was current and popular circa 800 B. C. Sāyana, in the fourteenth century A. D., had lost all memory of original real sense of the word. He interprets the words also as yajamāna,[73] hotā,[74] parichāraka[75] and Āsuri Prajā.[76]

67. (1) Atharvaveda 6. 83–1.
(2) Śukla Yajurveda 18. 48.

68 Nirukta 4. 26; 5 28; 12 29.

69. Lakshman Sarup; The Nighaṇṭu and the Nirukta; 1920; pages 70, 89, 193.

70. Siddheswar Varma, The Etymologies of Yāska; 1953; page 172.

71. (1) Ṛgveda 1. 12. 8. 1.
(2) Ṛgvede Saṁhitā (V. S. M.); Vol. I page 978.

72. Ṛgveda 10. 11. 7. 1.

73. (1) Ṛgveda 2. 1. 1. 8; 5. 1. 8. 23.
(2) Ṛgveda Saṁhitā (V. S. M.); Vol. II page 4.

74. (1) Ṛgveda 3. 1 63.
(2) Ṛgveda Saṁhitā (V. S. M.); Vol. II page 203.

75. (1) Ṛgveda 4. 1. 2. 3; 6. 4. 4. 16.
(2) Ṛgveda Saṁhitā (V. S. M.); Vol. II. page 503.

76. (1) Ṛgveda 2. 1. 11. 4.
(2) Ṛgveda Saṁhitā (V. S. M.); Vol. II page 37.

The word Viś in the Ṛgveda has generally been used in the sense of peoples.[77] The Ṛgveda has also mentioned Dāsī-people,[78] Deva-people, [79] Āryan people [80] and Dasyu-people. [81] It appears that the Ṛgveda used the word Jana for the totality of people in a given sovereign territory as a whole and the word Viś in the sense of inhabitants of a part of limited territory. [82] The word Viś has also been used in the sense of "settlement or dwelling." [83] The distinction between the institutions of Jana and Viś appears to be that the former is primarily an ethnic concept [84] while the later primarily is a territorial concept. Pre-Āryan Bhārata was constituted of autonomous local republics. Viś played important part in such local republics. The leader of Viś has been equated with a Grāmanī [85] This territorial concept of Viś distinguishes it from the concept of Jana. The people related to autonomous local republics were only a part of higher bodies, the Jana-republics such as Pañchajanāḥ. The institution of Viś, like the institution of Jana, originally appears to be pre-Āryan and non-Āryan.

Vaiśya

The word Viś has been mentioned in the Ṛgveda about 170 times but its derivative word Vaiśya appears only once in the Ṛgveda and that also in the late tenth Maṇḍala. Vaiśya here is

77. Ṛgveda 1. 6. 2. 1; 1. 7. 1. 5, 1. 7. 5. 5; 1. 9. 1. 7; 4. 3. 3. 4; 4. 5. 5. 8; 5. 4. 12. 1; 6. 1. 1. 7; 6. 1. 8. 4; 6. 1. 14. 2; 6. 3. 2. 2; 6. 4. 6. 15; 7. 1. 5. 3; 7. 1. 6. 5; 7. 1. 7. 6; 7. 2. 14. 10. and several others.

78. Ṛgveda 6. 3. 2. 2.

79. Ṛgveda 6. 2. 1. 9.

80. Ṛgveda 10. 1. 11. 4.

81. Ṛgveda 4. 3. 7. 4.

82. (1) Ṛgveda 2. 3. 4. 3.
(2) Ṛgveda Saṁhitā (V. S. M); Vol. II. page 107.

83. Ṛgveda 4. 1. 4. 3; 5. 1. 3. 5; 6. 2. 6. 4; 7. 4 1. 22; and several others.

84. R. C. Jain, op. cit. (M. A. A. S.) page 28.

85. Taittirīya Saṁhitā 2. 5. 4. 4.

spoken to have sprung from the thighs of Puruṣa.[86] This version regarding the origin of Vaiśya has been accepted in the Śukla Yajurveda.[87] The Atharvaveda mentions the Vaiśya to have sprung from the waist of the Puruṣa.[88] The springing of Vaiśya from Puruṣa is only a parable merely signifying the position of Vaiśya in the Āryan tribal collectivity now signified by Puruṣa or Prajāpati. It raises the interesting question of this class to the two other higher classes.

Ārya and Śūdra sections

We have earlier seen that the Brahman was the original universal tribal collective whose members were also known as the Brahmas. The Kṣatra were the original powerful indigenous leaders of Bhārata. After the historical coalescence, the two racial stocks, the white Ārya-Varna and the black Dāsa-Varna, fused into one transformed varna which after some time qualitatively bifurcated into the Brāhmana and the Ksatriya Varnas. Their fusion was ethnic. Their new growth was functional. One could become the other by adopting the function of the other. The Brāhmana-class and the Ksatriya-class in the Vedic age were mobile and fluid The class was determined by the actions of the individual. One could become a Brāhmana by adopting the magico-ritualistic functions and a Ksatriya by adopting the protective functions. Both the classes unitarily joined together for spiritual supremacy and temporal hegemony and the necessary conquence of this phenomenon was the division of the society into two sections, the rulers and the ruled in the political field, high and low in the social field and the exploiters and the exploited in the economic field. The rise of the Brāhmaṇa-class and the Kṣatriya-class disrupted the unitary tribal Brahma collective dividing it into the lordly Brahma-Kṣatra class and the subject, Śūdra class.

Subjection of Viśāḥ

Viśāḥ were originally free citizens of the land. After the conclusion of the Dāśarājña war, the free republics were annihi-

86. Ṛgveda 10. 7. 6. 12.

87. Śukla Yajurveda 31. 11.

88. Atharvaveda 19. 6. 6.

lated and the alien rule at the apex was forced. The free people became subjects. Viśāḥ became prajās, the subject people. The Tṛtsu victors in the Dāśarājña made the vanquished people their, not of their own, Viśāḥ or subjects.[89] The subjection of the members of the autonomous local settlements or Grāmas created a subject Vaiśya class. The Vaiśya class in the beginning was included in the Śūdra class It appears that the Brahma society, in the beginning, was twained in two classes only; the Brāhmaṇa-Kṣatriya exploiting class and the Vaiśya-Śūdra exploited class. The Vaiśya-Śūdra exploited class was known by the general name of the Śūdra only. The Śūdra meant the lower people, the service people. The exploiting Brāhmaṇa-Kṣatriya class assumed to itself the name of Ārya, previously applied to Brahmas only, thereby raising the status of the Kṣatriya exploiters. The Atharvanic Ārya-Śūdra references [90] denoting two socially opposed rival groups had recoiled upon the Brāhmanic society. This twained social situation of the Brāhmana society continued, at least, till the Aitareya Brāhmana age circa seventh century B. C. This important parable [91] precisely narrates this social situation. Soma is the food of the Brāhmaṇas. With this food thou wilt strengthen the Brāhmanas; in thine offspring will be born one like a Brāhmaṇa, an accepter of gifts, a drinker (of Soma), a seeker of livelihood, one to be moved at will. When evil happens to a Ksatriya, one like a Brāhmana is born in his offspring; the second or third from him may become a Brāhmana; he is fain to live as a sort of Brāhmana. This clearly establishes the identity of the Kṣatriya and the Brāhmana. The Vaiśya is a tributary to another to be eaten by another, to be oppressed at will. The Śūdra is born a servant of another, to be removed at will, to be slain at will. This description establishes the identity of the Vaiśya class and the Śūdra class. Both are subordinate to "another" master. The Śūdra is born a servant of another as Vaiśya is born a tributary

89. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 16. 6.

90. Atharvaveda; 4. 20. 4. 4. 20. 4, 8. 8.

91. (1) Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 7. 29.

(2) A. B. Keith; op. cit. (A. K. Brāhmaṇas); page 315.

to another, but Śūdra is not born as a servant of Vaiśya. This "another" does not include a Vaiśya, This "another" refers to the Brāhmaṇa class and the Ksatriya class only. The Vaiśya-like and the Śūdra-like offsprings born to Kṣatriyas when evil happens to them remain Vaiśyas and Śūdras only.

Origin of Vaiśya class

The Brāhmana-Kṣatriya exploiting gunta-had reduced the whole subject peoples to their servitude, but that could not continue for long. The numerous sections of the subject people carried on the avocations of agriculture, industries and trade. The historical coalescence of the two opposing racial groups, the Ārya-Varna and the Dāsa-Varna, had changed the nature and character of the new society. The powerful sections of both the races commanded the positions of power and supremacy. Many of those Āryans who remmained unupgraided joined the Bhāratīyan Viśāḥ, the Dāsas [92] and the Dasyus.[93] The Bhṛgus had joined the Dāsa-Viśāḥ even in the pre-Dāśarājña age. They sided with the Brahmāryan adversaries in the Dāśarājña war against Sūdās, Indra and Vasiṣṭha. The Brahmāryan tribal collective in the Atharvanic age stood disrupted. The common Brahma people, who could not usurp the positions of the Ksatriyas and the Brahmaṇas, took to agriculture, trade, commerce and industry. They joined the cadre of their freedom loving erstwhile adversaries. The Śūdra section included both the Brahmic and the Bhāratīyan Vaiśyas and the service-people. The Brahma section brought its megiro-ritualism and the Bhāratīya section its freedom. They strenuously struggled for raising their status vis-a-vis the Brāhmaṇa-Kṣatriya exploiting class. The Brahma-Bhāratīyan Śūdras now had begun to live in families. The freedom in social life and the possession of the means of production and acquisition of wealth far widened the frontiers of the freedoms of this calss. The Śūdra section in the Brāhmaṇa society came to be divided into the class owning freedom and

92. Ṛgveda 6. 3. 10. 3; 6. 5. 11. 6; 7. 5. 13 1; 8. 4. 4. 27; 10. 3. 9. 3, 10. 5. 9. 6; 10. 6. 15. 1; 10. 9. 3. 3.

93. Ṛgveda 10. 7. 2. 19.

the class "selling" freedom. The freedom of the owning class asserted itself which had in due time to be recognised by the ruling class. These contradictions in the subject Śūdra section came soon to the fore. This class as a whole could not be kept under servitude for long. The exploited class disrupted, the owing class "progressing" from the servile status to the exploiting status. The Śūdra section became divided in lhe Śūdra proper and the Vaiśya classes.

The Vaiśya class was admitted to a higher status than the servile Śūdra class though to a lower status from the Brāhmana Kṣatriya classes. The dividing line of the two cultures and civilizations, the Brahmāryan and the Bhāratīyan, was Yajña, which, at this age, had become ritualised. The right to migico-ritualism was the measure of the conferment of a higher status. This right of magico-ritualism, which was already possessed by the Brahma Viśāḥ, was extended to their Bhāratīyan compatriots who joined the Brāhmana society. The conferment of the ritualistic right on the Vaiśyas and its withdrawal from the Śūdras raised them to a higher status than the Śūdras. But the Vaiśyas could not use the sacrificial ritual for the attainment of kingdom or supreme over-lordship; they could sacrifice only for prosperity [95] and for wealth. [96] The Vaiśyas became members of the Brāhmaṇic hierarchy and won their way to the Āryan materialistic exploitation. Their position in the Brāhmaṇic society was somewhere in the middle between the arch-exploiters, the Brāhmaṇa-Kṣatriya class and the common Śūdra people. They were now admitted to the exploiting Brāhmaṇa society but were themselves also exploited by the higher classes. The Vaiśyas, therefore, became a curious mixture of the freedom-bearer, as an exploited and the Brahma-bearer, as an exploiter. The Vaiśyas consistently followed, through long chequered history of Bhārata, their this dual role of reaction and reform. The Vaiśyas separated from the common Śūdra class in the post-Aitareya Brāhmaṇa age somewhere in the middle of the seventh century B. C.

94. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 1. 6.

95. Taittirīya Saṁhitā; 2. 5. 4 4.

96. Taittirīya Saṁhitā; 2. 5. 10. 2.

5. ORIGIN OF THE ŚŪDRAS AND THE ANTĀḤ

Etymology of Śūdra

The word Śūdra has not been etymolised by Yāska. Bādarāyaṇa divides the word in two parts Śuṣ "Grief" and dra from √dru "to rush." [97] Śaṅkara gives three explanations of this derivation, one of which is "grief rushed on him." [98] The word Śūdra may be a compound of two words śus and dra. The word śuṣ means "became dry or withered, fade, languish, decay, injure, hurt, extinguish, destory." [99] The word Dra has not satisfactorily been explained. The word Dru means "run" hasten, attack, assult, to become fluid, dissolve, melt, drive away, put to flight." [100] The word Dra has been used with the word Kṛṣṇa; Krsnadra. [101] Griffith considers this word as unintelligible. [102] The Atharvaveda uses the word also in some other context. [103] It speaks of Prajāpati and Death respectively as real and non-real. Thereon depend the worldly ones, meanidg the human race and in me are glory Dra and Vra. This is an instance of comparative Vedic method. We may relate Dra to Prajāpati and Vra to Death. Dra, then, may mean glory, great and large. Griffith understands this word probably corrupt. [104] If Dra be taken a compound word formed of Da+Ra, with the vowel of the former shortened, Dra would suggest the meaning given to these two words. Da means "giving, granting, offering." [105] Ra means "gold." [106] This is also the connotation of the

97. Vedānta Sūtra 1. 3. 34
98. George Thibaut; Vedānta Sūtras; S. B. E. Series, 1962, Vol. 34 page 225.
99. Monier-Williams; op. cit , page 1084.
100. Monier-Williams; op. cit., page 502.
101. Atharvaveda 9. 7. 4.
102. Ralph T. H. Griffith; The Hymns of the Atharvaveda; 1916; Vol I Page 454 Note.
103. Atharvaveda 11. 7. 3.
104. Ralph T. H. Griffith; op. cit., Vol. II page 75 Note.
105. Monier-Williams; op. cit., page 464.
106. Monier-Williams; op. cit., page 869.

word Dāsa, traced to √das, in the sense of giving.[107] The association of the word Dra with Kṛṣna, the black, may indicate its relationship with the Dāsa-Varna or the Kṛṣṇa-Varṇa. The word Dāsa, as seen earlier, has the connotation of the distributer, giver or supervisor of social wealth. The word Śūdra, according to Bādarāyaṇa, may mean "grieved by violence." If we take Dra in the above sense, the word Śūdra may mean "withered, destroyed, extinguished or violently overthrown people, existing in large numbers and one time the givers of gold." In short, it may mean "grieved Dāsa." Śūdra indicated the pre-Āryan and the non-Āryan large population violently over-thrown and subjugated.

Ārya-Sūdra Dichotomy

The Ṛgveda informs us that at the beginning of the Vedic history, Bhārata had two mutually opposed racial groups; the Āryans and the Dāsa-Dasyus; the Ārya Varṇa and the Dāsa-Varna, the white-complexioned and the black complexioned. The Rgveda is the history of the war of extermination of the Dāsa people at the violent hands of the Āryan people. When the indigenous people and their leaders coalesced with the victor society, both underwent a qualitative change. The erstwhile Dāsas became Āryans. Indra prescribed the mode of Dāsa conversions. Indra himself converted Dāsas into Āryas. Sāyana explains it that Indra taught the Dāsas the Āryan yajñic way.[108] When the Dāsas were coverted to the Āryan way, they could not remain the same detestable people as they were in the early Ṛgvedic period. The memory of the earlier Ārya-Dāsa conflicts had to be obliterated for the harmonious growth of the mixed society. This social reason led the composers and the redacters of the post-vedic literature to substitute the word Dāsa with some other word. They coined the word Śūdra for Dāsa.[109] The Ārya-Varṇa and the Dāsa-Varna coalesced into one Varṇa; the transformed Ārya-Varna now including the Dāsa converts also. This

107. Ṛgveda 6. 2. 7. 10.

108. Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā (V. S. M.); Vol. III page 91.

109. Atharvaveda 5 22. 6. 7.

coalesced single varṇa had the Bhāratīyans within its fold. This coalesced single Āryan-Varṇa had the rest of the Bhāratīya people, as their opponents which they now termed the Śūdra. The Śūdra-Varṇa replaces the Dāsa-Varna. Fever is ordained to go to Dāsī-girl and Śūdrā-girl in Śaunakīya Atharvaveda. In Paippalāda, the word Dāsī has been substitued for the word Śūdrā. [110] The two words were considered interchangeable. The word Dāsa has also been used in the sense of a slave [111] doing menial work just like Śūdra.

When Dāsa came to be replaced by Śūdra, we no more hear the Ārya-Dāsa dichotomy. The Ārya-Dāsa dichotomy becomes replaced by Ārya-Śūdra dichotomy. The Śūdra man stands opposed to the Āryan man. The man with a charm for the acquisition of superhuman powers of sight looks on everyone therewith, each Śūdra and each Āryan man. [112] He looks on the Āryan and the Śūdra man alike. [113] The creation of the Śūdra is averred along with the creation of the Ārya [114] In this the Ārya-Śūdra dichotomy, Śūdra is a non-Āryan. The Śukla Yajurveda speaks of sinful act done to the Śūdra or the Ārya. [115] The Atharvaveda speaks of Takman going to the Śūdra. [116] The Taittirīya Saṁhitā compares the Śūdra to a horse, an animal. [117] This reminds us of the Ṛgvedic abhorrence of the Dāsas as amānusas. The wrong to the Śūdra or the Ārya [118] is placed along with wrongs to others. The post-Ṛgvedic Samhitās are very clearly conscious of the Ārya-Śūdra dichotomy as the Ṛgveda Samhitā is of Ārya-Dāsa dichotomy in the sense of two separate independant mutually opposed racial blocks.

110. Atharvaveda (Paippalāda), 13. 1. 9.

111. Ṛgveda 1. 14. 8. 8; 1. 22. 28, 7. 5 16. 7; 10. 5. 2. 10.

112. Atharvaveda 4. 20 4

113. Atharvaveda 4. 20. 8.

114. (1) Śukla Yajurveda 14. 30.
(2) Taittirīya Saṁhitā 4. 3. 10. 2.
(3) Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 8. 4. 3. 12.

115. Śukla Yajurveda; 20. 17.

116. Atharvaveda; 5. 22. 7.

117. Taittirīya Saṁhitā; 7. 1. 1. 6.

118. Taittirīya Saṁhitā; 1. 8. 1. 3.

Brāhmanised Śūdra

The Ārya-Varna (transformed) now indicated the new ruling class. The Śūdra Varna signified the ruled class, the rest of the Bhāratīya humanity. The Ārya-Varṇa was a unitary class. The other word in use in this age is the Brahma-Varna which on transformation becomes the Brāhmana-Varṇa. The Brāhmana-Varṇa signifies the sociological aspect. The Brāhmana-Varna till the rise of the Kṣatriya-Varna is unitary. The creation of The Kṣatriya class within the Brāhmana class with clear-cut partition of the spheres of yajñic exploitation, created a totally new situation. There were certain Āryan dissenters who could not satisfactorily participate in the yajñic exploitation. They, hence, took to avocations followed by the Dāsas and joined their ranks The Āryan violence fell on them alike their Dāsa compatriots. This process also continued from the Ārya-Dāsa times to the Ārya-Śūdra times. The residue from the Brāhmana and the Kṣatriya classes had raised a new class within the Brāhmana fold as distinguished from the non-Āryan Śūdra racial stock. This class was constituted of the Brahma dissenters, Brahmic yajña-phala-excludeds, Brahmic Viśāḥ, non-Āryan Bhāratīya Viśāḥ, vanquished Dāsas and Dasyus turned slaves and the other Brāhmaṇic and the Bhāratīyan have-nots who had become aggregated within the Āryan pale. This residue class within the Āryan fold has been termed in the previous section as the Śūdra class originally including the Vaiśya class also within it. The post-Ṛgveda Saṁhitās are a bit sympathetic to this new social group which was heading towards a division into classes. The chanter requests the Darbha to make him dear to Brāhmana and Rājanya, dear to Śūdras and dear to Ārya.[119] This Atharvanic hymn appears in the later nineteenth Kāṇḍa which may only be placed at the end of the Atharvanic period.[120] This hymn puts all the four classes on equal status. The love of the Śūdra is as much aspired of as that of a Brāhmaṇa. These sentiments have

---

119. Atharvaveda 19. 32. 8.

120. William Dwight Whitney; Atharvaveda 1962, Vol. I page CXLI and Vol. II page 895-898.

further been repeated.[121] Charm made by a Śūdra or a Rājanya is placed on equal footing with that made by a Brāhmaṇa or a woman.[122] The Brāhmana, the Vaiśya and the Śūdra have been at one place, lumped together and made obedient to Rājanya, in the Taittirīya Saṁhitā.[123] The Śukla Yajurveda provides us with heartening evidences of Brāhmaṇa-Śūdra equality and the two Ārya-Śūdra divisions within the Brāhmaṇic fold. The Śūdra woman has an Āryan lover and an Āryan woman a Śūdra lover,[124] an undiscriminating state of social equality. The salutary speech is addressed to the Brāhmana and the Ksatriya, to the Śūdra and the Ārya.[125] The Ārya in this context means a Vaiśya. In this significant hymn, the Brāhmana society is clearly shown to have two divisions. The Brāhmaṇa and the Ksatriya lumped together as one section and the Śūdra and the Vaiśya lumped together as another section. We thus find that the post-Ṛgvedic Samhitās mention two types of Ārya-Śūdra dichotomies; one within the Brāhmanic society and the other between the Brāhmanic society as a whole standing against the Bhāratīyan society as a whole.

The Śūdra section within the Brāhmanic society though exploited by the Brāhmaṇa-Ksatriya clique had the right to yajña in this period. The Ṛgveda and later Vedic Saṁhitās along with the Brāhmaṇas equate Agni with yajña.[126] Agni and hence yajña gives lustre to the Śūdras along with the Brāhmaṇas, the Kṣatriyas and the Vaiśyas.[127] The Yajurveda equates the Śūdra with penance,[128] remembering his Bhāratīya spiritual heritage. The Yajña places brilliance in the Brāhmaṇas and the princes. It also places brilliance

121. Atharvaveda; 19 62. 1.

122. Atharvaveda; 10. 1. 3.

123. Taittirīya Saṁhitā; 7. 5. 10. 1.

124. (1) Śukla Yajurveda; 23. 30. 23 31.
(2) Taittirīya Saṁhitā, 7. 4. 19. 3.

125. Śukla Yajurveda, 26. 2.

126. (1) Ṛgveda 3. 1. 3. 4. and others
(2) Atharvaveda; 13. 4. 8 and others.
(3) Śatapatha Brāhmana 5. 2. 3. 6 and others.

127. Śukla Yajurveda; 18. 48.

128. Śukla Yajurveda; 30 5.

in Vaiśyas and Śūdras.[129] Here in this hymn Vaiśyas and Śūdras are grouped together. The Yajñas confer lustre and brilliance upon those who perform them. The Brāhmaṇas and the Kṣatriyas admittedly performed yajñas and won lustre and brilliance. Similarly the Vaiśyas and the Śūdras also performed yajñas and obtained lustre and brilliance. These two hymns unequivocally prove that the Śūdras along with the Vaiśyas had the right to yajña. This appears perfectly natural also in the formation of the Śūdra group in the Brāhmaṇical society. The several constituents of the Brāhmaṇic society, already having right to Yajña, had joined or were forced to join the Śūdra section within the Brāhmaṇic society and they naturally could not be disinherited from their already acquired yajñic heritage. This element of Āryan-yajñic ritualism later became the main cause of the disruption of this Śūdra section within the Brāhmaṇic society. The main socio-economic function of the Vaiśya now became trade and commerce. Agriculture and industry became degraded to be followed by the Śūdra working classes. The Vaiśya became an intermediary and an agent of the yajñic exploitation of the Brāhmaṇa-Kṣatriya monopoly. The Vaiśyaic yajña was for the acceleration of his wealth. He became higher and religious by performing domestic yajñas that gave him social right of exploitation to the fruits of agriculture and industry. The Vaiśyas joined the hierarchy of yajñic exploiters as a junior partner. The Śūdras became divided as the Brāhmaṇic Śūdras and the non-Brāhmaṇic Śūdras. They are the bearers of the inhuman brunt of the total exploitation of the three upper classes, the three Varṇas. The non-Brāhmaṇic Śūdras never aspired for yajña. The Brāhmaṇic Śūdras were deprived of the right of yajña and consequently of lustre and brilliance, for being better exploited by the three higher Varṇas.

The upgrading of the Vaiśya constituent of the Śūdra section of the Brāhmaṇic society materially changed the character and nature of the residue portion. The Śūdra met his to be or not to be in the age of the Taittirīya Saṃhitā, the

---

129. Taittirīya Saṃhitā; 5, 7. 6. 4.

latest of all the Vedic Saṁhitās. The Śūdras enjoy the right to yajña during the age of the Atharvaveda and Yajurveda. They also have this right in the earlier part of the Taittirīya Samhitā age but appears to have been on the road of losing it in this very age. The Śūdra is declared not fit to yajña.[130] He has been historically debarred from the yajña ritualism. The transitional process goes on for some time during the early Brāhmaṇa period. This varṇic division solidifies during the age of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa circa sixth century B. C.

The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa leans towards the social division of the Ārya-Śūdra dichotomy. The Brāhmaṇa-Kṣatriya section stands against the Vaiśya-Śūdra section within the Brāhmanic society. The Paṁchaviṁśa Brāhmana equates Śūdra with a non-Brāhmaṇa but within the Brāhmanic society. Vatsa and Medhātithi both are sons of the black-skinned Kaṇva of the Ṛgvedic fame to whom the Aśvins had offered white-complexioned girls. Medhatithi reproaches his brother (as if not to himself) with the abuse that he (Vatsa) was the son of Śūdra mother and hence a non-Brāhmana. The Jaimini Brāhmana equates Vatsa with Triśoka and calls him the son of an Asura-mother.[131] This clearly indicated that the Śūdra and the Asura stand interchangeable. The epithet Asura, as seen before, was transferred to the Āryan adversaries in the later Vedic period and hence we may equate Asura with the Ṛgvedic Vṛtras, Rakṣas, Paṇis, Dāsas, Dāsīs, Dasyus and their kinetic stock. The Śūdra thus becomes the lineal inheritor of these Āryan adversaries. This Brāhmaṇa also reflects the Ārya-Śūdra dichotomous state within the Brāhmaṇic society.[132] The Śūdra has here also become excluded from the Yajña.[133] We, in this Brāhmaṇa have a comprehensive story of the gradual degradation of the Śūdra class. This degradation becomes

130. Taittirīya Saṁhitā; 7. 11. 1. 6.

131. (1) Paṁchaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa; 14. 6. 1.

(2) W. Calland; Paṁchaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa; 1931; page 367.

132. (1) W. Calland; op. cit., page 82.

(2) Paṁchaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa; 6. 5. 14.

133. Paṁchaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa; 6. 1. 11.

complete in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa age. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa repeats some of the earlier Vedic events and occurrences. The creation of the Śūdra and the Ārya [134] reminds us of the Ārya-Śūdra dichotomy in the sense of two mutually opposed racial stocks. The Ārya-Śūdra dichotomy within the Brāhmaṇa society is also still afresh. The sin against the Ārya and the Śūdra is placed at par with the sin against any one [135] The love of an Āryan to a Śūdra woman is referred; [136] but the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa Ṛṣi, could not tolerate the narration of the story of love of a Śūdra with an Āryan woman; hence this Vedic truth has totally been concealed from the Śatapatha age people. We are now witnessing the hardening forces against the Śūdras. The Śūdra is finally disinherited from the right to yajña ritualism. He has now no right to sacrifice, hence he is excluded from entering the sacrifice hall. [137] He along with Vaiśya has become enclosed on both the sides within the Brāhmaṇa and the Kṣatriya olique-cell so that he may be kept submissive to them [138] If any king puts any Śūdra or whomsoever else, not having the right to sacrifice, to sacrifice; he meets darkness. [139] In Puruṣamedha, the Śūdra is to be sacrificed so that the sacrificer may obtain all the fruits of toil. [140] This clearly establishes the right of the sacrificers to the total exploitation of the fruits of the working classes. The Kṣatra has a right to horse, the Brāhmaṇa to a he-goat but the Śūdra along with the Vaiśya only to an ass.[141] Finally the Śūdra becomes equated with woman, dog, and crow and they are all untruth; [142] meaning non-existent. They do not exist for themselves; they exist only for others. The degradation

134. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa; 8. 4. 3. 12,
135. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa; 12. 9. 2. 3.
136. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa; 13. 2. 9. 8.
137. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 3. 1. 2. 9–10.
138. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa; 6. 4. 4. 13.
139. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa; 5. 3. 2. 2. 4.
140. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa; 13. 6. 2. 10.
141. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa; 6. 4. 4. 12.
142. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa; 14. 1. 1. 31.

of the residue Śūdra Varṇa is complete. The Dāsa was an amānuṣa; the Śūdra is untruth (non-existence).

The Śūdras have no right to yajña. They have no right to the knowledge of the Vedas. They have only the right to the knowlrdge of the Itihāsa, the Atharvaveda, the Purāṇa, the Sarpavidyā and the Asura-Vidyā. [143] The Itihāsa and the Purāṇa relate to pre-Āryan history and legends. The Sarpavidyā refers to the sciences developed by the Ahi people. The Asura-Vidyā indicated the sciences and the humanities known to the Brahmāryan adversaries. The Atharvaveda for long, at least till the Śatapatha times, was not recognised a Veda. The Brāhmaṇas recognised only three Vedas; the Ṛgveda, the Yajurveda and the Sāmaveda. These limitations to the acquisition of knowledge connect the Śūdras with the pre-Āryan and the non-Āryans.

We have a class known as Antyajas, Pañchamas or the Untouchables. They are even today, through the long course of history of 3000 years, outside the pale of the Brāhmanic society. Their status is lower than even the Śūdras. The origin of these people has been given in a parable of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. [144] Viśvāmitra, now a convert to the Brāhmana fold, wrought through the mediacy of Aṅgiras, wanted to adopt Śunaḥaśepa to stop Puruṣamedha. The condition was that he was to be adopted as the eldest son to get the inheritance of Viśvāmitra. Viśvāmitra had 101 sons. He asked his sons to agree to this arrangement. His fifty younger sons led by Madhuchchhandas accepted their father's proposal. The elder fifty sons rejected this wrong proposal. Viśvāmitra cursed them, "Your offsprings shall inherit the Antān. These are the (people) the Āndhras, the Puṇḍras, the Śabaras, the Pulindas and the Mūtibas." Most of the Dasyus are the descendants of Viśvāmitra. The fifty sons and Madhuchchhandas accepted the overlordship of Devarāta, Kuśika name of Śunaḥaśepa, transferred their inheritance to him along with their sacred lore. And they got material prosperity in return to their submission to the Brahmāryan fold. A. B. Keith has

143. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa; 13. 4. 3. 7. 13.

144. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa; 8. 18.

translated the word Antāh as "the ends" (of the earth)." [145] This is manifestly wrong. Inheritance goes with blood. The Āndhras and others were the proto-Australoid people who already had been living in Bhārata at the time of the Brahmāryan invasions. They were also living in large numbers beyond the borders of the land colonised by them. The curse could have no sense to send the people to regions where they already lived. The word Antāh used as Antān in the Śāṅkhyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, would, hence, mean the lowest racial stock. The Dasyus were the greatest adversaries of the Brahmāryans. They received the most inhuman treatment at their hands. The vanquished freedom-loving Dasyus who did not submit to the Brahma rule had, by sheer force of circumstances, to migrate to the regions beyond the Brahma borders. They began to be called the Antāḥ, later known as the Antyajas, the untouchables. These Antāḥ are the broken men [146] of the Brāhmaṇic history, lingering on with their sheer physical existence through 3200 years. They honoured their freedom, their soul-right, more than material prosperity. The origin of the Antāḥ may be traced to the indomitable spirit of freedom.

Who are these Śūdras, these Antās ? The Andhras and other Dasyus originate from Viśvāmitra who was Bhārata-ṛṣabha belonging to the Pūru tribe of the Ahi sub-race. They are placed along with the Vrātyas, the non-Āryan tribes, by Manu as earlier discussed. The Vrātyas include within them the Ikṣvākus. The Ikṣvākus, the Prāchya-Ikṣvākus, the tribes of the Ahi sub-race, the Pañchajanāḥ and other Bhāratīya tribes who loved their freedom most and did not submit to the Brāhmaṇic overlordship were violently and ruthlessly reduced to the states of Antāḥ, like the Ṛgvedic Dasyus. From them also sprung the Brāhmaṇic and the non-Brāhmaṇic Śūdras. They became victims of the graded Varṇic exploitation. It is not only from the Purāṇic solar race alone that the Śūdras descended. They may rightly trace their lineage to both the socalled Purāṇic solar and lunar races and to the Viśaḥ.

145. A. B. Keith; op. cit, (A. B.); page 307.

146. Dr. B. R. Ambedkar; The Untouchables; 1948; page 30.

They were the members of the great Bhāratīya republics, local and autonomous. They are the original masters of their motherland, the Bhārata.

6. EXAMINATION OF DR. AMBEDKAR'S THESIS ON THE ORIGIN OF THE ŚŪDRAS AND THE ANTĀH CLASSES

Ambedkar's Thesis

Dr. Ambedkar has given us two monumental theses on the origin of the Śūdras and the untouchables. These are the salient points of his thesis[147] on the origin of the Śūdras.

1. The Śūdras are one of the Āryan communities of the solar race.

2. The Āryan society originally recognised only three Varṇas; the Brāhmaṇas, the Kṣatriyas and the Vaiśyas. There was no separate Śūdra Varṇa. They ranked as part of the Kṣatriya Varna of the Indo-Āryan society.

3. There was a continuous feud between the Śūdra kings and the Brāhmaṇas in which the Brāhmaṇas were subjected to many tyrannies and indignities.

4. The Brāhmaṇas, hence, refused to perform the Upanayana of the Śūdra.

5. The denial of Upanayana degraded the Śūdras below the Vaiśyas to the fourth Varṇa.

6. The present day Śūdras are not the original Śūdras. The low class Hindus have no lock stock with them. The Śūdras of Hindu society have no connection with the Śūdras of Āryan Society. The following are Ambedkar's main points of thesis[148] regarding the origin of the untouchables.

1. Untouchability has no racial or occupational basis. There is no racial difference between the Hindus and the untouchables.

---

147. B. R. Ambedkar; Who are the Shudras ?; 1947; pages III–V, 240, 236.

148. B. R. Ambedkar; The Untouchables; 1948; pages V, 29, 31, 186, 166.

The primitive tribal nomadic societies faced continuous internecine tribal warfare and with the settled societies. Defeated tribes gave birth to the groups of broken tribesmen. Untouchables were originally only Broken Men.

3. Antyas do not mean untouchables. They mean people living on the outskirts of the village.

4. Untouchability was born sometime about 400 A. D.

Myth of Āryan Supremacy

Myth-hunt is the most powerful of all the hunts. The greatest myth of our age, though in the process of explosion, is that the Āryan culture and civilization is the first civilizing force of the human race. The human society, as so nicely put by Lewis H Morgan, before the advent of Āryan civilization was a primitive and barbaric society. Many a great scholars and leaders of humanity had been and are today a prey to this great seemingly invincible Āryan myth. Dr. B. R. Ambedkar is no exception. He fell prey to this Āryan myth and this great erudite scholar, an eminent advocate and a great leader of depressed humanity dwarfed himself. He gives Śūdras an Āryan origin. He assumes that the Āryans never invaded India and conquered her original inhabitants; that the Dāsas and the Dasyus had no racial distinction with the Āryans both belonging to the same race; and that the Āryans and the Dāsa-Dasyus were not different in colour. [149]

Āryan origin of Śūdras Unfounded

The Sapta-Sindhu-Āryan-cradle-land theory has not been accepted by any non-Indian scholar and a majority of Indian scholars. This theory can not explain satisfactorily the several knotty problems regarding the presence of the Āryans in different parts of the world, wide apart from each other in the third and the second millenniums B. C. The south-Uralic region may be their original home. [150] Quite apart, the Āryans came to India from some foreign land. Otherwise, the whole of the Ṛgveda would be senseless and meaningless.

149. B. R. Ambedakar; op. cit. (W. S.); page 82.

150. R. C. Jain; op. cit. (M. I. A. S.), Chapter II section 2.

The Āryan (technically called the Brahmāryan in India) adversaries own forts, immense wealth, lands, irrigation projects and everything but the Āryans have none of them. They have to win them from their adversaries. They could not have been fortless-wealth-less, land-less, and property-less in their own homeland. Indra is only a Purandara, never, a Pura-pati. Their languages, beliefs, social and political institutions and military organisations are quite opposed to each other. That would not happen in a mutually opposed two sections of a single racial society.

The Dāsa-Varṇa has been used in the Ṛgveda as opposed to the Ārya-Varṇa. Ambedkar takes this word in the sense of "Faith, Religious doctrine, choice of Creed or Belief," adopting its meanings from the various uses of the word in Zend-Avesta.[151] The contradictory faiths do not lead to material disparities. They have not been referred to even remotely as a cause of war between the two sections of the Ṛgvedic society even in the Ṛgveda. The Ṛgveda definitely asserts the main cause of Āryo-Dāsa wars the winning of cattle, wealth, riches and lands. The five Ṛgvedic Ṛcs referred by him support this thesis. Indra entered the confiding hostile and heightens the Śukla Varṇa.[152] Soma, the slayer of men, is the slayer of Asura-Varṇa.[153] Ṛṣi Agastya cohabits with Lopāmudrā. They get progeny and both the Varṇas prosper.[154] Lopāmudrā was a Vidarbha princess of the dark-skinned Yadu tribe,[155] a Dāsa-tribe. The two Varṇas here refer to two bloods mixing into one. Agastya, son of Mitra-Varuṇa from Uravaśī,[156] was white-complexioned while Lopāmudrā was black-complexioned. Indra's protection is sought against Dāsa Varṇa.[157] He annihilates Dāsa-Varṇa and seizes triumphant the cherished

151. B. R. Ambedkar; op cit. (W. S.); pages 79-83.
152. Ṛgveda 3. 3. 5. 5.
153. Ṛgveda 9. 4. 4. 2.
154. Ṛgveda 1. 22. 15. 6.
155. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit. (A. I. H. T.); page 146, 168-169.
156. Ṛgveda 7. 2. 16. 10.
157. Ṛgveda 1. 15. 11. 2.

treasures of the enemy [158] (the Dāsa-Varṇa). None of these Ṛcs refer to any faith. They singularly refer to material prosperity.

The Dāsas and the Rākṣasas have been referred to alongwith Āryas as the enemies and opponents of Indra.[159] This only suggests that some of the Āryans had gone over to the Dāsas like the Bhṛgus The Dāsas and the Dasyus were not a primitive people. They were as civilised as the Āryans and in fact more powerful than the Āryans. Of course, numerous Dāsas and Dasyus were converted to the Āryan fold but they could not be completely absorbed by the Vedic Āryans. These Dāsas and Dasyus were more cultured and more civilized than their Āryan invaders. The Āryan system was not a civilising force but was definitely an evilising force. [160] They are responsible for the present day naked collective violence and collective exploitation. If this thesis could have been prevailed upon the learned savant, he would not have traced the origin of the civilised Śūdras to the evilized Āryans.

Original Masters

The Śūdras are given the Āryan Kṣatriya origin on the basis of the Mahābhāratic Sudās being a Śūdra who has been identified with the Ṛgvedic Sudās belonging to the Bharata race. There are no Śūdras in the Ṛgveda and there is no Sudās of the Bharata race in the Mahābhārata. Sudās of the Ṛgveda is not a Bharata but a Tṛtsu, the enemy of the Bharatas. The Bharata was the collective name of the Ten-Republics confederacy that fought against Sudās, the Tṛtsu, as earlier shown in chapter II. The Purāṇic Sudās belonged to the North-Pañchāla Paurava line. [161] Vedic or Purāṇic literature does not know of any śūdra tribe of any Kṣatriya race. The solar race or the lunar race is a Purāṇic fiction. The Śūdras need not trace

---

158. Ṛgveda 2. 2. 1. 4.

159. Ṛgveda 6. 3. 10. 3; 6. 5. 11. 3; 7. 5. 11. 1; 8. 4. 4. 27; 10. 3. 9. 3; 10. 7. 2. 19.

160. R. C. Jain; The Great Revolution 1967 ; page 80.

161. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit. (A. I. H. T.); page 148.

their origin only to the non-Āryan and the pre-Āryan solar race. They can trace their origin to the non-Āryan and the pre-Āryan lunar race also. Really they are the descendants of Bharatas, the collective name of these socalled lunar and solar tribes along with the Ahi tribes. The Śūdras are rightly the descendants of the Bharatas, the most civilized and the most cultured pre-Āryan and non-Aryan original masters of Bhārata.

Śūdra-Varṇa

It is not true to assert that the Āryan society originally had three Varṇas. The Āryan society originally had only one Varṇa, the Brahma or the Āryan Varṇa. The non-Āryan Dāsa-Varna stood opposed to it. The Ārya-Dāsa Varṇas became Ārya-Śūdra Varṇas during the post-Ṛgvedic age. The Ārya-Varṇa twained into the Brāhmaṇa and the Kṣatriya Varṇas and the Śūdra-Varna into Vaiśya and Śūdra Varṇas. We have fully detailed the processes of the formation of these four Varnas in the foregoing sections.

Brāhmaṇa-Śūdra Feuds

Ambedkar is correct in his statement that there were continuous feuds between the Btāhmaṇas and the Śūdras, We have noticed continuous feuds earlier during the Ṛgvedic age between the Āryans and the Dāsas. The feuds of Purūravas and Nahuṣa with Brāhmaṇas, if at all happened, are pre-Ṛgvedic. Nīmi, Kalmāśapāda and Ambarīṣa are purely mythical figures. The feuds between Vasiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra took place in Ṛgvedic times. But all these feuds, so ably narrated by Ambedkar, are not post-Dāśarājña events which concluded circa 1100 B. C. After that great historical event, we definitely find coalescence between the two feuding contenders. The Śūdras are placed at par with the Brāhmaṇas in the post Ṛgvedic Saṁhitās and are a highly exalted people owning the lustre and brilliance of the yajña. The Varṇas were fluid and mobile till the Śatapatha age circa sixth century B. C. They, by then, had not solidified into the castes. It is, therefore, not justified to arrive at the conclusion that the Brāhmaṇa-Śūdra feuds ended in the degradation of the latter.

Upanayana, a late Phase

The Upanayana argument of Ambedkar is also not convincing. The Yajña and the Veda have not become associated with Upanayana in the pre-Sūtra period. The Vedic, the Brāhmaṇa, the Āraṇyaka and the Upaniṣadic literature do not know the Upanayana. It is only in the Sūtra period that we meet the Upanayana and associated with the study of the Vedas and the performance of the yajñas. The Sūtra period has been fixed circa 400 B. C. [162] We do not find any Brāhmaṇa-Kṣatriya conflicts between 1100 B. C. and 400 B. C. Rather, the Brāhmaṇa-Ksatriya axis has been forged and strengthened for deepening down the graded Varnic exploitation. It is no doubt true that the Brāhmanas refused Upanayana to Śūdras but that was the phenomenon of the age circa 400 B. C. There was no Upanayana before 400 B. C. The Upanayana after 400 B. C. was conferred on the Ksatriyas. The denial of Upanayana has nothing to do with the degradation of the Śūdras.

Crucible Uncrucibled

Ambedkar has made an astounding statement that the present day Hindu Śūdras can not be identified with the Āryan Śūdras. Whom does he himself represent, the Āryan Śūdras or the Hindu Śūdras ? His Āryan Śūdras constituted a very thin minority, probably 6000 only. [163] They are no more in sight and Dr. B. R. Ambedkar has worked out a long thesis for the Śūdras who have vanished from history. He maintains that the disabilities of the original Āryan Śūdras have been transferred to the present-day Śūdras by the clever and ingeneous Brāhmaṇas. But who are the present-day Śūdras ? Dr. Ambedkar has not given us the origin of the present day innocent Śūdras. The history of the origin of the original culprits is not at all relevent according to him for knowing the origin of the present day innocent Śūdras. What did Dr. Ambedkar attempt then ? What had been the purpose of the whole thesis : Who were the Śūdras ?

162. A. A. Macdonell; A History of Sanskrit Literature; 1958; page 250.

163. D. R. Ambedkar; op. cit. (W. S.); pages 236-237.

Antāḥ broken men of Brāhmaṇic History

Ambedkar's thesis on untouchability is better than his Śūdra thesis. Only he has not given it in a dialectical historical way. The untouchables or the Antāḥ are the Broken Men of the Brāhmaṇic history. They are the Dasyus descended from the Bharata-ṛṣabha Viśvāmitra of the Pūru line of the Ikṣvāku-Ahi origin and the other Bhāratīyans. They are not the result of the primitive internecine tribal wars nor the remnant groups of the defeated tribes. There was no primitive tribal society in Bhārata before the advent of the Āryans. The extensive domains of Bhārata had a network of widely dispersed autonomous and settled republics. There was no nomadic population in Bhārata, the most developed country in agriculture and industries during that period. The violent struggles between the nomadic semi-barbarian Brahmāryans and the peacefully settled Bhāratīyans which culminated in the final annihilation of the latter in the Dāśarājña war rendered a most numerous Bhāratīya population dejected, ruined and homeless. Those who patiently suffered and accepted the loss of their freedom and slaved themselves by joining the Brahma society could gain livelihood and shelter. Those who cherished their freedom most were cruelly pursued and driven away to the last and the lowest status and they ultimately formed the army of the Broken Men. These Broken Men of the long drawn Brāhmanic history are the people who are today known as the untouchables, the Śūdras, the Aboriginal Tribes and the Criminal or the notified Tribes.

Still a Burning Problem

The fog of the Āryan cultural supremacy dimmed the sight of Ambedkar and hence he could not give a true historical origin of the Śūdra and the Antāḥ problems. The inhuman and degraded plight of these sub-humans of the Indian society dates back to the Ṛgvedic period thirty centuries before. These victims of history have awfully preserved their existence at animal level through this long course, starting from the Brahma conquest to the end of the British rule. The rediscovery of this historical truth is the most urgent and prima gloy of our age.

7. ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF THE JĀTIVĀDA (CASTE SYSTEM)

Essential Features

The problem of caste as obtaining in the present Hindu society has baffled many scholars, reformers and revolutionaries. It appears to be a very complex and complicated problem. It has become as inexplicable as Brahma-māyā. The essential features of the caste system as it operates in India of today are very peculiar to it. There is no parallel, past or present, to this system in any of the society in any part of the world. The membership of the caste is essentially determined by birth. Caste by custom and usage has formulated strict and rigorous rules and regulations, incorporated in the Śāstras, regarding marriage, diet and occupation of its members. The supremacy of blood in the caste system has given rise to gradations of castes stratigraphically high and low. The caste system has grown round the central theme of the prestige and supremacy of the Brāhmaṇa-Varṇa, originally the Ārya-Varṇa. It has pervaded the whole body structure of the Hindu society and influenced other neighbouring societies also. The caste system is essentially the economic organisation of the Hindu society.

Varṇa and Jāti

We have earlier seen the growth of sociological Varṇas. The dialectical development of the white complexioned Ārya-Varṇa due to the impact of conversions to it of the Dāsa Varṇa, the formation of a transformed Ārya-Varṇa, its division in Ārya and Śūdra Varṇas within one social unit gave birth to the system of hierarchical social organisation. The Brahma is not single, undivided, unmixed, unpolluted now. The Ārya Varṇa again disintegrates into the Brāhmaṇa and the Kṣatriya Varṇas which further instigates the division of the Śūdra-Varṇa; the dissenting Vaiśya Varṇa forcing its way to the hierarchy of the two higher Brāhmaṇa and Kṣatriya Varṇas. Varṇa, a one time colour concept, changes into a sociological concept. But this sociological Varṇa till the end of the Śatapatha

period circa sixth century B. C. is a fluid and mobile concept. It has not yet hardened into a segregated, exclusive social institution of Casteism or Jāti-Vāda. The Śāstric word for this novel phenomenon is Jāti. The word Jāti has not been used in the Vedic literature though the words Jana and Jāta have abundantly been used. Janas or Jātas of the Vedic age did not form Jātis. The classification of social groups on the basis of blood was quite unknown to the Vedic seers. We first witness the word Jāti in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa[164] in the sense of Vedic Prajā.[165] Prajā in vedic literature means progeny, offspring. It has no blood or ethnic sense. The multitude of Vedic offsprings was the result of the social form of promiscuous sex-relationship. Blood is important only in family relationship; the individual relationship of one-wife, one husband. This was the influence of the Bhāratiya institution of family that the word Prajā in Aitareya times begins to be replaced by the word Jāti. The second use of the word Jāti, in the sense of kinsfolk, appears in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa.[166] We do not notice the use of this word in any other pre-Mahāvīra Vedic, Brāhmaṇic and Upaniṣadic literature. Jāti was unknown to the Indian society in the middle of the first millennium B. C.

From Varṇa to Jāti

We find the Jāti in the Sūtra period which may be placed in the second half of the first millennium B. C. The word Varṇa became identified with the word Jāti in this age. Varna, a concept denoting fluidity and mobility of social organisation, came to be replaced by Jāti, a hardened, immobile and sterile social organisation. The Jāti springs from the Varṇa, is its lineal descendant inheriting all that was owned by the Varṇa. The most ancient Sūtras and Smṛtis speak of four Jātis; the Brāhmaṇa, the Kṣatriya, the Vaiśya and the Śūdra, each preceding

164. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa; 2. 39.

165. A. B. Keith; op. cit. (A. K. Br.); page 162.

166. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 1. 8. 3. 6.

caste being superior by birth to the one following.[167] The Jāti is transformed Varṇa.

The growth of Vedic Varṇavāda into Hindu Jātivāda in its extreme exclusiveness is the history of conquest of a conservative, reactionary priestly class armed with the ideology of an antiquated pedantic magico-ritualism over a healthy and living nation that taught to that priestly class the metaphysics that has been the historical pride of numerous scholars and statesmen: including Mahatma Gandhi; Maxmüller, Jawaharlal Nehru and Radhakrishanan; that India displays the continuity of history of its culture and civilization while several other renowned cultures and civilizations of the World lie burried under the debris of time. The conquered contributed the forces of permanence and integration while the conquerors brought the fissiparous forces of disintegration and degradation. The forces of peace and non-violence are continuously living in India. The forces of disharmony and violence are also visible by their side. The growth of the caste system (Jātivāda) is a glaring example of this social force of Evil.

Varṇa-Dharma-Jātivāda

It has generally been agreed that the caste system has grown out of the Varṇa system. The Varṇa-Dharma rules and regulations of Manu rather give the rules and regulations of the caste system which was declared to be the very essence of Dharma.[168] The Jāti-Dharma or the Jātivāda came to be identified with the Hindu Dharma. If a Hindu observed Varna-Dharma, which in practice meant the practice of caste rules and regulations, he was an ideal Hindu. The following of the Jātivāda in India is an interesting chapter of history. We can not do better than to draw upon the views given in the History and Culture of the Indian people, prepared under the guidance of a staunch Sanātanī Hindu who believes in

167. (1) Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra; 1. 1. 1. 4–5.
(2) Vaśiṣṭha Dharma Sūtra; 2. 1–4.
(3) Manusmṛti; 1. 31.

168. R. N. Dhandekar; Man in Hindu Thought; A. B. O. R. I. Vol. XLIII. page 48.

the Sapta-Sindhu cradle-land of the Āryans and described by her (Indian) sons so that the world might catch a glimpse of her (India's) soul as Indians see it. [168] This is how we see the growth of our caste system, our Jātivāda. [169]

History of growth of Jātivāda

The Ṛgveda was redacted circa 1000 B.C.[170] It was redacted after the Āryans had successfully made India their homeland. The military victory was won but the original race-feeling or the contrast which the Ārya-Varna (Vedic Āryans) felt between themselves and the Dasyu-Varṇa (aborigines), and which was sought to be mitigated by the incorporation of the conquered population into the frame work of the Āryan society by admitting them into the fourth class or caste. [171] We witness a casteless, though classified, society in the bulk of the Ṛgveda [172] The period of the Sūtras witnessed the gradual hardening of the caste-system in general and the deterioration of the position of the Vaiśyas and the Śūdras in particular. The chronological strata in the Sūtras; the Śrauta-Sūtras, the Gṛhya-Sūtras and the Dharma-Sūtras; depict a gradually hardening status of the Vaiśyas and the Śūdras. The power of the Brāhmaṇa is growing. The Śūdras are divided into Niravasita and Aniravasita. A class of Śūdras were forced to reside outside the limits of the village or the town. The Rāṣṭra or nation consisted only of the three higher castes, the Śūdras being excluded from it. The Gṛhyasūtras clearly differentiate the status, occupations, obligations, duties and privileges of the four principal castes in matters both spiritual and secular. The sacrament of Upanayana is invented. The Brāhmaṇa class and the Kṣatriya class were closest in power and the two together being as it were the moral and material props of society. The

169. K. M. Munshi; History and Culture of the Indian People (Vol.) The Vedic Age; 1957; Foreword page 7.

170 (1) R. C. Majumdar; op. cit. (V. A.), Preface page 27.
(2) B. K. Ghose; op. cit. (V. A.); page 225.

171. V. M. Apte; op. cit. (V. A.); page 450.

172. V. M. Apte; op. cit. (V. A.); page 386.

cultural and social status of the Vaiśyas gradually deteriorates and they come close to the Śūdras. They are placed in one and the same category along with women and Śūdra in Bhagavadgītā (9. 32). There is a wide gulf between the Śūdras and the three higher classes. The mixture of non-Āryan elements was probably responsible for this, as the word Ārya has a racial as well as moral connotation in this period and meant practically "reborn," that is, a member of the three higher classes The Dharma-sūtras show that the caste distinction has outstripped its proper limits and has even invaded the field of civil and criminal law. It has to be recognised, however, that the caste-system even in this period had not become as wooden and exclusive as it is now. Inter-dining and inter-marriage (in anuloma form) were not prohibited Even outcaste could be readmitted to the Āryan fold. Nor were the castes so strictly separated or ramified into so many caste divisions as are obtaining today. But we see in the Dharma-sūtras the beginning of the formal theory of defilement resulting in the taboo of all contact on the part of a pure man of the upper castes with an impure man, namely, a member of the lower caste. [173] Graded inequality develops into graded impurity. We may place the Sūtra period circa 400–100 B. C.

During the age of Kauṭilya, we find the same stereotyped castes as in the Dharma-sūtras. Manusmṛti implants the final seal on the fate of the Śūdras. Manusmṛti may be placed circa 200 A. D. [174] The Śūdra had few privileges and many obligations. The discriminating laws against him and his social disabilities, uttered with brutal frankness, were an inheritance of the past. Manu treats Śūdras exactly like a slave and prescribes barbarous punishments for him. To crown all, it is laid down that a Brāhmaṇa shall perform the same penance for killing a Śūdra as for killing a cat, a frog, a dog or a crow. But interdining and inter-marriage (in

173. V. M. Apte; op. cit. (V. A.); page 507–510.

174. G. Bühler; The Laws of Manu; Sacred Books of the East Series Vol. XXV; 1886; Introduction page CXIV.

anuloma form) is not absolutely prohibited. The idea of untouchability or impurity even of the Śūdras as a caste, was generally growing but had not yet become a rigid law or practice. The numbers of mixed castes grew. The old theory of caste adumbrated in the Vedic, especially the Sūtra texts, was developed and elaborated in this age. Though the caste system was becoming more rigid, and the lot of the Śūdra was becoming harder and harder, it had not yet reached the stereotyped form in which we find it today. [175]

By the beginning of the Gupta age, a strong Brāhmanical reaction had set in against the ascendancy of rival faiths like Buddhism and Jainism. In the field of social life, this movement manifested itself in a tendency towards intensification of the social division into four fundamental Varnas with its corollary of the pre-eminence of the Brāhmanas [176] As a result we find that, within India's borders at any rate, the reform movement started by Buddhism and Jainism had lost much of its momentum, while the Brāhmanical Counter-Reformation had become a power to reckon with The Smrti laws are followed and the Brāhmana enjoys his added supreme power and prestige The mixed castes grew numerous. The class of untouchables comes into existence The members of the untouchable caste lived in the dwellings marked by a distinctive sign and lying outside the city There were also aboriginal tribes. They existed since the Rgvedic age but their conditions further deteriorated in this age. The rules regarding slavery were developed in the Gupta age.

In the later part of the first millennium A. D , we find the old spirit of caste segregation reflected The later Smrtis follow and even surpass their predecessors in emphasising the social and religious disabilities of the Śūdra class. Even the sight of a lower class member has become pollutive. Even the Jainas, Pāśupatas, Bauddhas, Kaulas and so forth are

175. Radhakumud Mookerji and R. C. Majumdar ; The Age of Imperial Unity (H C. L. Vol. II); 1952; pages 544-546.

176. U N. Ghoshal; The Classical Age (H. C. I. P. Vol. III); 1954; pages 555-558.

classed with Śūdras as untouchables and impure.[177] The caste system is in the process of hardening. In the early part of the second millennium A. D.; the caste differences become increasingly rigid. The attitude towards the Śūdras is getting increasingly narrow. The Smṛtikāras brand them with the stigma of untouchability. Food, touch and sight taboos are enforced. The ban of untouchability is extended to Buddhists, Jainas, Lokāyatas, Nāstikas, followers of Kapila, Śaivas and Śāktas outside the Vedic pale or Śāktas of the left-hand sect. There were a number of historical instances of individual Brāhmanas and Brāhmaṇa families normally following the occupations of the Kṣatriyas. The Śūdras for the most part conformed to the rules and regulations laid down for them by the Brāhmana canonists. But there are a few instances where Śūdras take up the functions of the higher classes and assumed the Ksatriya's occupations of ruling and fighting. The mixed castes, new Ksatriya dynasties and Kāyasthas emerge. Slavery is the well-known institution in this age. The aboriginal tribes are further degraded.[178] The caste system has further hardened in this age. The social exceptions help the hardening processes more and still more.

The middle of the second millennium A. D. witnesses a new historical force. The Muslim invasions of Bhārata had begun in the later part of the first millennium A. D. The Muslim rule entrenched itself strong and firm by the fourteenth century A. D. The Islamic conquest was attended by extensive settlements of the foreigners whose number was being increased by constant migrations from the Islamic lands as well as by occasional mass conversions of the indigenous people. The social structure of the indigenous people still consists of four primary castes with diminishing rank and status, an indefinite number of the so-called mixed castes of varying status and finally of a group of despised castes

177. U. N. Ghoshal; The Age of Imperial Kanauj (H. C. I. P. Vol. IV) 1955; pages 369–372.

178. U. N. Ghoshal; The Struggle for Empire (H. C. I. P. Vol. V); 1957; pages 475–478.

at the bottom of the scale. Social disabilities and prohibitions for the Śūdras vary from comparative laxity to extreme rigidity. The Smṛti-rules are further hardened. Discriminatory clauses, caste-wise, are noticed in the Smrti penal law. There were groups of mixed and despised castes and also the slaves. This social pattern varied according to the conditions prevailing in different regions of the country, specially in the south. The operation of the Smṛti laws was necessarily restricted by the occupation of large tracts of the country by arms of Islam [179] Islam appears to be a liberalising force though, in course of time, it itself became influenced by it, against the Brāhmanic caste tyranny and violence The caste system took its present shape in the middle of the second millennium A. D. This state of the Hindu society continued through the Moghul and British rules

Causes of Growth

We have now to seek the causes, in general, of the ever hardening and ever-segregating growth of the caste system. The Vedic Varnic society, as we have earlier noticed, was a fluid and mobile society The Varnic coalescence was almost complete by the end of the Upanisadic age in the middle of the first millennium B C. Magico-ritual exploitation is at the foundation of the Varnic system After the resolution of the Brāhmana-Ksatriya rivalry in the division of the fruits of communal sacrifices and the severance of the Vaiśya class from its parent the Śūdra class and its joining the magico-ritual exploitative classes, the ruling classes achieved all what they had to achieve. There was no hindrance, no obstruction, now, in plans and designs of economic exploitation of the productive Vaiśya and Śūdra classes, a part of the Vaiśya class acting as the agent of the exploiting masters. Now this state of social organisation had to be solidified and laid on securer and permanent basis. This social necessity led the Varṇic system transforming itself into the caste system. These satanic social designs of the caste-ists were staunchly

179. U. N. Ghoshal; The Delhi Sultanate (H. C. I. P. Vol. VI ; 1960; pages 578-582.

opposed by the indigenous population outside the pale of the Brāhmaṇic fold. Mahāvīra and Buddha led the revolutions against the caste-ics violence and exploitation. Mahāvīra declared that no one was high or low on account of mere birth. A man was high or law; a Brāhmana, a Kṣatriya, a Vaiśya and a Śūdra, in consonance with the actions he pursues.[180] Chāṇḍāla Harikeśī was an honoured member of the monastic order of Mahāvīra.[181] Buddha considered the caste system as artificial and propounded that all Varnas are equal; the superiority of the Brāhmana class over others is a shallow cry.[182] Indeed, Mahāvīra and Buddha both were totally against the Varna or caste system, and much more against its graded inequalities. This assertion of human freedom by the leaders of the indigenous people interfered with the magico-ritual loot and plunder of the caste-ites. Next, Mahāvīra and Buddha had organised Śramana Samghas consisting of ascetics who had renounced everything materialistic in the world. They preached the freedom of soul and its ultimate ascendancy to perfection. Siddhi (Final Attainment) and not Swarga (Heaven) was their ultimate goal. This was the highest human aim but it cut at the very roots of the magico-ritual practices of the caste-ites. The impact of the indigenous system over the social organisation of the caste-ites based on magico-ritualism drifted the evolution of their system in the direction of hardening and secularization. The forces of violence and exploitation got the upper hand. The forging of unity between the warrior and the priest gave added power and strength to these forces. The anti-forces of freedom and peace could not triumph over this social system and the result was the segregated caste system of the Sūtras and the Smṛtis. The triumph of economic explotation cleared the way for the social and religious, exploitation of the caste-ites. Jainism and Buddhism failed to root out the civilization of Varṇism or caste-ism.

---

180. Uttarādhyāyana Sūtra, 25. 31.

181. Uvāsagadasāo Sūtra, chapter XII.

182. Majjhima Nikāya; 2. 5. 8; 2. 4. 4.

India suffered the Scythian and Huna invasions in the early centuries of the christian era. They were amalgamated into the local population but they imparted the elements of taboos, pollutions and unadjusted behaviours that furthered the sterilisation of the caste system. The Purānic renaissance of the Gupta age enhanced the power and prestige of the Brāhmanic supremacy The deliberate economic and administrative policies of the Gupta rulers annihilated the remnants of the caste-ite opposition which led to the further consolidation of the caste system. The rise of various religious schools, the fear of the loss of material opportunities, the secrets of trades, the rules of various guilds and the sense of individualism engendered by the disintegrating philosophies and doctrines further divided the Indian mass of humanity into further secularised caste groups. The ruling Brāhmana class of the north had developed separatist mentality in the political sphere and the ruling Dravidian class in the economic sphere. Both the currents joined together in strengthening the separatist and divisive institution of caste. The factors of the coalescence of two opposed races giving birth to mixed castes, the patrilineal and matrilineal systems, anuloma and pratiloma marriages, colour occupations, modes of worship, differences in rituals, variety of religious and philosophical beliefs, ideas of magic, taboo, mana and matter, vasteness and varieties of geographical factors, foreign immigrations of various peoples, chaos in political and economic order and instability of existential factors, disunity and lack of strong political organisation combined together to create this vulgur and ugly monster of caste before the Islamic conquest of Bhārata. The advent of Islam introduced a new factor. The uncompromising religion of Islamic monotheism could not make peace with the cowardly religion of Hindu Polytheism ; and hence arose the clashes of religions and cultures. The intolerant attitude of the Islamic rulers and their policy of mass conversions led to the fear-stricken tightening of the caste system for the preservation and security of its members. The racial arrogance of the British far outstripped and outwitted the racial arrogance of the original Brahmas. The history took the revenge in the shape of the Āryan smiting

his elder brother, the most ancient Āryan, the giver of the most ancient Āryan record. All these various factors; political, economic and social; went into the factory of the Hindu social system in the production and consolidation of the full-fledged artificial caste system of the present day. The aggrandisement of the higher caste at the cost of the lower caste continued unabated to be the motive force of Hindu social organisation till the end of the British imperialistic rule.

Annihilation of Caste-Ideology

The twentytwo years of our freedom and the four democratic elections on the basis of adult suffrage have further hardened the caste system to the benefit of the exploiting classes This is the high time that we change our way and system and finally and completely annihilate the demon of this rejuvenating caste system. The poison of caste is recoiling on all the spheres of our activities, political, social, economic and administrative. Our political parties have bogged down into the mire of caste system. The caste-pulls are clearly discernible in our trade and commerce; national and international. Our social endeavours have been blighted by this caste-craft. In spite of the Himalayan efforts of Swami Dayanand and Mahatma Gandhi; the demon of caste is gaining health day by day. It is drawing its life from its foundational source, hence we have to annihilate this source; the ideological basement of the caste-system. This ideological source, contained in the Śāstras; that is repugnant to the standards of Truth and Non-violence has to be firmly rooted out. It demands nation-wide creative effort of the whole Indian society; governmental as well as private. Every moment lost is to nation's peril. Jātivāda is Non-Existence, Untruth and non-existent we have to make it.

CHAPTER X

THE DRAVIḌAS

Draviḍa Problem

The ethnic compositions that we have earlier discussed cover northern Bhārata from Afganistan and Beluchistan to Bengal and Assam and from Kashmira and Himalayas to Vindhya mountains including Andhra to the south of Vindhyas and Orissa to the east. The rest of the southern Bhārata, called Deccan, still remains untouched. The Deccan including Andhra is presently populated mostly by the ethnic stock called the Dravidas by the sociologists and Mediteraneans by the anthropologists and the archaeologists The Dravidian problem had always been and presently is a complex problem of the Bhāratīya history.

The Draviḍa, as an ethnic stock, unknown to the Brāhmanical literature before 200 A. D., the date of the compilation of Manusmrti Manu mentions the Draviḍa along with the Ikṣvāku Malla and Licchavi as a Vrātya. [1] The Dravida has again been mentioned along with the Austric Paundrakas and Kambojas and the non-Āryan Yavanas, Śakas, Pāradas, Pahlavas and Daradas. [2] The Dravidas have been associated with the non-Āryans The Dravidas were themselves the non-Āryans. The land of these non-Āryan Dravidas was unknown to the Brahmāryans in the age of Pāṇini circa 450 B. C. and vaguely became known to Kātyāyana circa 250 B. C. It became known to them intimately only in the age of Patañjali circa 150 B C. [3]

Drāviḍī

The oldest extant literature of the Deccan, the cen-Tamiz or old Tamil literature of the Sangam period, cannot be,

1. Manusmrti; 10. 22.
2. Manusmrti; 10. 44.
3. R. G. Bhandarkar; Early History of the Deccan; 1957; pages 15-17.

from the form of the language, be anterior to the middle of the first millennium A. D. although some of the extant works in their original forms, may go back to the centuries immediately after Christ. [4] But the literature of a people generally portrays, not only contemporary life and events, but also just preceding traditions and events. We may take it that what the Sangam literature portrays is the culture which existed in the extreme south between the third century B. C and the third century A. D. The Sangam literature gives us the custom of urn-burial and the manner in which the royal funerals were performed in those times. The material relics of this social custom are preserved in the megalithic burial and urn-field culture so predominant in the Deccan. The megalithic and urn-field culture seems to have been a dominant factor of early Tamil civilization, in the pre-Sangam epoch, i. e. earlier than the last three centuries B. C. and earlier, too, than effective Āryan contact with South India. [5] The excavations at Arikamedu by Mortimer Wheeler have yielded eighteen potsherds bearing graffiti. Their language appears to be Early Tamil (as distinguished) from the Tamil found in the early Tamil literature, as well as modern Tamil with a sprinkling of Prākṛt. They seem to be more akin to the ancient Drāviḍī script than the regular Brāhmī as found in the edicts of Aśoka and other early inscriptions. The script found on the graffiti has been dated to the third and second centuries B. C. [6] The pre-Aśokan ancient Drāviḍī script appears to have affinities with the Brāhmī script. It separated from the Brāhmī at the latest in the fifth century B. C. [7] The Brāhmī was derived from

4. S. K. Chatterji, Indo-Āryan and Hindi, 1960; page 43.
5. K. R. Srinivasan, The Megalithic Burials and Urn-fields of South India in the Light of Tamil Literature and Tradition; Ancient India; Number 2; pages 13, 15.
6. Sir Mortimer Wheeler; Arikamedu; Ancient India; Number 2, page 109.
7. G. Bühler; Indian Palaeography; Indian Studies; Past and Present; Vol. I No. I; 1959; page 2?.

pictographs, ideographs and phonetic signs, the earliest specimen of which are to be found in the Indus Valley inscriptions [8] This Indus Valley script, also called the Ancient Sindh Punjab script, has been proposed to be read by Father H Heras through Cen-Tamiz or Old Tamil which he christens as Proto-Dravidian. [9] But his system has not been accepted by the linguists as it lacks all sound philological methods. This Sindh-Punjab script appears to be like the earlier forms of Maurya Brāhmī of the 4th-3rd century B. C. [10] It appears reasonable to assume that the original Brāhmī script bifurcated into the Maurya Brāhmī and the Drāviḍī scripts in the middle of the first millennium B. C. The Brahmāryan conquerers of Bhārata adopted this Indus Valley or Sindh-Punjab script for their Āryan speech probably in the tenth century B C. [11] We do not still find any evidence of the adoption of this script by the Dravidas in this age. It appears that they adopted this script and the language later than the Brahmāryan foreigners.

Iron-Using Megalithicians

The ancient Tamil civilization is the representative civilization of the Deccan at the opening of the Christian era. The megalithic and urn-field culture is a dominant factor in the early Deccan or Dravida civilization The megaliths are the huge stone structures constructed to the burials of the dead They prominently appear in the Deccan and very rarely in the northern India The megalithic burials have yielded also iron implements. The introduction of iron cannot be dated in India earlier than the beginnings of the first millennium B. C The megalithic monuments in India have been dated earliest in the third century B. C. though their counterparts in other parts of Asia, in Africa and in Europe have been dated upto 2000 B. C. These iron-using

8 R. B. Pandey; Indian Palaeography, 1957, page 51.

9 Father H. Heras, Studies in Proto-Indo-Mediterranean Culture; 1953; page 158. The whole chapter one is useful for this study.

10. S. K. Chatterji; op. cit., page 45.

11. S. K. Chatterji; op. cit., page 53.

megalithic people migrated to Bhārata from the Mediterranean region between 700 B. C. and 400 B. C. [12] The Draviḍas belong to the Mediterranean stock. The language of the region had been in this age Drāviḍī. The literature of the Draviḍas also eulogises the megalithic burial. We may be safe in identifying the megalithic folk with the Draviḍas on the strength of the evidence that we presently possess.

Linguistically, the oldest word for the word Tamil appears to be the Prākṛt word Damila. The word Damila might have some association with its parent, the original or Proto-Brāhmī, the pre-Āryan national alphabet of Bhārata. We find that the Lycians of Asia Minor, who originally belonged to the island of Crete in this Mediteranean Sea, called themselves Tammili The Hellenic Greeks wrote it as Termilai. The words Termilai and Damila appear to belong to the same speech-family. The Hellenic Greeks had established their final suzerainty in the Greek Mainland and the Aegean circa 1000 B. C. The Greeks in Bhārata noted a people called Arabitai, they might very well have been the Dravidian speakers of the southern Sindh in the fourth century B. C., and the name suggests the one which the Telugus apply to the Tamilians-Aravalu ' and Arava is explained scholastically as the Sanskrit word arava "speechless, voiceless," suggesting the unintelligibility of Tamil as a language for the Telugus.[13] The Telugus are the Āndhras. The Āndhras were the progeny of the Dasyu-chief Viśvāmitra,[14] the hero of the Dāśarājña war, who may safely be associated with the Indus Valley or Harappa culture which I call the Bhāratīya culture. The Āndhras were the proto-Australoid people who did not understand the language of the Mediteranean Draviḍas. The Harappan Brāhmī script has affinities or resemblances outside India,

12. K R. Srinivasan and N. R. Banerji; Survey of South Indian Megaliths; Ancient India No. 9; Page 114.

13. S. K. Chatterji; Race Movements and Pre-Historic Culture (in Vedic Age); 1957; page 59.

14. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 7, 18.

with the Elamite script and with those of ancient Crete and Cyprus and it looks very probable that the people using this script and language had connections with the people of Eastern Mediteranean world. The Hellenic Greeks violently annihilated the indigenous inhabitants of the Greek Mainland and the Aegean. Their peaceful life was disturbed and they were uprooted from their national home. The great historical dispersal set in. They earlier had intimate contacts through international trade with the peoples of the east. They were great voyagers and sea-faring people. They sailed towards the land of their old friends and entered Bhārata through the southern fringes of Baluchistan and Sindh They discovered the alien Āryan people in possession of the country to the north, hence they followed the route to the south, the south that was known to them for centuries. They proceeded through the coastal regions of the lower Indus and Gujerat to the Decan.[15] Though they were the speakers of the sister language; the Cretan script and language and the proto-Brāhmī script and language may have originated from a common source, but both the sisters had remained separated for long due to second millennium B. C. international trouble and chaos wrought by the Āryan militarism, that both could not recognise each other, hence the proto-Australoid Bhāratiyans, in the later first part of the first millennium B. C, could not understand the language of these intruders. Some of them might have come a bit earlier for peaceful trade. Their earlier peaceful penetration might have facilitated this historical onrush of these people The local people assimilated them and the languages of both resulted in cultural assemblage giving birth to the Drāviḍī script and language, an offshoot of the Brāhmī script and language. These Mediteranean people might have been joined by the Phoenician and the Arabian sea-faring people who, with commercial stimulus, might have come to Bhārata and taking advantage of its chaotic conditions decided to colonise

15. Jules Bloch; Sanskrit and Dravidian (in the Pre-Āryan and Pre-Dravidian in India); 1929; page 37.

it. This might have happened between the 10th and 7th centuries B. C.[16]

Mediterraneans

The anthropologists [17] and the linguists [18] have accepted the division of the Indian ethnology into main races with nine sub-types, advocated by Dr. B. S. Guha. Dr. Guha sub-divides the Mediterranean race into three : (1) Palaeo-Mediterranean, (2) Mediterranean and (3) The so-called Oriental Type. Guha attributes the megalithic traits to the Palaeo-Mediterraneans.[19] He defines Palaeo-Mediterranean as medium-statured, dark-skinned and of slight build found largely in the Kannaḍa, Tamil and Malayalam tracts. The other two types are taller, fairer and of long build, generally found in North India. This division of the Mediterranean race into two mutually opposed and contradictory types raises an interesting ethnological problem

Archaeology provides us with a clue to this problem. The West Bhāratiyans had contacts with West Asia and the Mediterranean regions in the fourth and third millenniums B C. The Panis of Bhārata carried on extensive international trade with these regions. As discussed earlier, it appears that a large mass of people from the upper parts of the Mediterranean region came to Bhārata via land routes in the early part of the third millennium B. C. The arrival of the peasant potters from Iran in this period is also significant. This mass scale peaceful immigration of these Mediterranean people gave great impetus to the village economy of the Western Bhārata.[20] They had as their neighbour the remark-

16. D H. Gordon, The Pre-Historic Background of Indian culture; 1958, Page 181.
17. (1) L. D. Krishna Iyer and L. K. Bala Ratnam; Anthropology in India ; 1961; page 86-87.
    (2) D. N. Majumdar; Races and Cultures of India; 1958; page 32.
18. S. K. Chatterji; op. cit. (R. M. P. C.); pages 142-143.
19. S. K. Chatterji; op. cit. (R. M. P. C.); page 143-144.
20. B. Subbarao; The Personality of India; 1958; page 122.

able urban civilization of the Indus Valley.[21] They were welcomed and assimilated by the proto-Australoid population of the region.[22]

The international trade amongst these civilized communities of Bhārata, Mesopotamia, Egypt and the Aegean came to a stand-still in the second millennium B. C. due to violent disruptions by the semi-barbarous Āryan militarists. The inter-communications between different parts of this Śramanic region had almost ceased. The exodus of the people began when there were largescale upheavals wrought by foreign occupations of the different parts of the region. The linguistic evidence produced by the words Termilai and Arbitai does not go beyond the first part of the first millennium B C This linguistic evidence may, therefore, relate to the later branch of the Mediterranean people rather than the earlier branch The geographical conditions made the proto-Australoids of the north fairer than the proto-Australoids of the south The Mediterraneans who merged in the proto-Australoids of the north remained of fairer colour. The geographical conditions of the south remained less favourable hence the inhabitants of the south remained darker The Mediterraneans who passed through lower Sindh and Gujerat to Deccan and mixed with the darker proto-Australoids there developed the physical features of the Dravidians that we meet today. We wrongly call them palaeo-Mediterraneans only because of their colour and skin without taking into account the geographical environment The Palaeo-Mediterraneans of Guha came later than his pure Mediterranean and the socalled Oriental types who, in fact, were the ancient or palaeo-Mediterraneans The Mediterraneans who may be connected with the Megalithic culture are the Mediterraneans who intruded into Bhārata in the first part of the first millennium B. C., who superimposed their culture on the indigenous population and developed a script and language, distinct of its own, but joining the main stream of Brāhmī culture-world only to separate in due time, developing its

21. D. H. Gordon, op. cit., page 57.

22. D. N. Majumdar; op. cit., page 48.

own individuality. This discussion clearly indicates that the people whom we today call Dravidians is a post-Āryan phenomenon in Bhārata. They, the Dravidians, did not exist in any part of Bhārata or Greater Bhārata during the age of and Brahmāryan conquest of Bhārata and till many centuries after. This raises the problem of Dravidianism vis-a-vis Proto-Australoidism.

Mythic Antiquity of Draviḍas

The oriental scholars, almost without exception, the linguists, the archaeologists, the anthropologists and others, have fallen prey to the hypothesis that the Draviḍas occupied the whole of Bhārata, north as well as south, at the period of Āryan invasions and they were gradually thrown out of the regions occupied by them. They are the Dāsas and Dasyus of the Ṛgveda, the owners of the big forts, great wealth, vast riches and the superior knowledge of sciences and humanities and the successors of a great spiritual heritage This picture of the past has wrongly been reflected on the image of the present. The advanced state of the present-day Dravidians over their proto-Australoid compatriots has misled the scholars to construct that image. The veil of this ignorance has started to be lifting owing to the researches in the Austric culture, civilization, language and traditions. A comparative understanding, hence, of the Austric and the Dravidian cultures and civilizations would be fruitful.

The Austrics and the Dravidians

On the material side, the Austrics had invented the art of pottery and agriculture. They knew the cultivation of rice and cotton, raising of some important vegetables and the manufacture of sugar from the cane. The art of weaving silken and cotton cloths was invented by them. They had learnt to domesticate and train the elephant. They knew the uses of charcoal and wood. Moustaches beautified their faces. They knew a variety of birds and animals. They knew counting by twenties. They knew the sciences of mathematics, medicine and astronomy. The Austrics were a peaceful democratic people. They had no kings dwelling in palaces and ruling

over small districts and their inhabitants. The Dravidians, on the otherhand, of the socalled pre-Āryan age, as given by Bishop Caldwell, had kings dwelling in strong houses ruling over small districts of country. They knew alphabetical characters written with a style on palmyra leaves bundled together in a book They were armed with bows, arrows and spears and knew the horse. They delighated in war. Agriculture, weaving and medicine were also known to them. They knew canoes, boats and ships. [23] Horse was quite unknown to the pre-Āryan people of Bhārata. The invention of alphabet is conventionally dated circa 1000 B. C. These two significant factors make these Dravidians a people of the first millennium B C. The institution of kingship is a feudal phenomenon which began to take its shape all over the world by the middle of the first millennium B C. These Dravidians appear to be the post-Brahmāryan intruders of Bhārata.

The Austrics had names for all the parts of Bhārata designated by special nomenclature The geographical names of the different parts of Bhārata depicted by the words Pulinda-Kulinda, Mekala-Utkala (with the group Udra, Pundra, Munḍa), Kośala-Tośala, Anga-Vaṅga, Kalinga-Tilinga form the links of a long chain which extends from the eastern confines of Kashmir upto the centre of the peninsula. These are the non-Āryan non-Dravidian Austric words. [24] Udumbaras were the Austric people of northern India. [25] Kāmarūpa and Tāmralipti belonged to the east. [26] Drāviḍī does not give us any geographical names of any part of Bhārata.

The philosophical beliefs of these two ethnic stocks are divergently different. The Austrics believed in the plurality of souls; they had some notions of future life and had active

23. These observations are based on S. K. Mukerji's chapter "Race Movements and Pre-historic culture" in Vedic Age.

24. Sylvain Levi; Pre-Āryan and Pre-Dravidian in India (op. cit.); page 95.

25. J. Perzyluski; op. cit. (P. A. P. D. I) page 160.

26. Sylvain Levi; op. cit., page 112.

faith in the doctrine of transmigration of soul.[27] The Dravidians believed in the existence of god whom they styled ko or king, a realistic title little known to orthodox Hinduism. They created to his honour a "temple" which they called Ko-il, god's house (koyil or kovil) They had also developed the Pūjā ritual.[28] This Pūjā ritual is distinct from the Brahmāryan yajñic magico-ritualism and the Austric spiritualism. The philosophical beliefs of the Dravidians are superior than those of the Brahmāryans but inferior than those of the Austric people.

Myth of Palaeo-Mediterraneans

Two arguments are advanced to prove the pre-existence of the palaeo-Mediterraneans or the so-called Dravidians before the Āryan military invasion. One is anthropological and the other is linguistic. The anthropological argument is based upon the discovery of certain Mediterranean skeletal remains at Mohenjodaro. The anthropologists are veering round the view that the mixture of the Mediterraneans with the proto-Australoids in the Indus Valley region occurred fairly early[29] and both became amalgamated. It would, therefore, be presumptuous to accept the existence of the pure Mediterraneans at Mohenjodaro before the Āryan invasion. This anthropological factum has further been otherwise corroborated by the archaeological evidence. The Deccan has yielded several sites representing chalcolithic cultures before the violent intrusion of the Megalithic folk. The beginning of the chalcolithic culture is dated at circa 1500 B. C at Nevasa.[30] It continues at Brahmagiri between 1000-200 B C. The Megalithic culture here superimposes itself after circa 200 B. C.[31] It reigns at Nasik between 400 B. C.

27. S. K. Chatterji; op. cit. (I A. H.), page 39.

28 S. K. Chatterji, op. cit. (R. M. P. C), page 159-160

29. D N. Majumdar; op. cit; page 36.

30. H. D. Sankalia; From History to Pre-History at Nevasa; 1960 pages 67-68.

31. R. E. M. Wheeler; Brahmagiri and Chandravali 1947; Megalithic and other cultures in Mysore state; Ancient India no 4 page 202.

and 1000 or 1500 B. C.[32] It existed upto the first half of the first millennium B. C. at Maheswar and Nāvadātoli.[33] The excavations on the numerous chalcolithic sites in the Deccan have yielded similarities of form and fabric between the chalcolithic cultures of Nāvadātoli, Nāgdā, Prakāśa, Bahal, Navasā-jorve, Māskī, Piklihal, Sangankallu, Brahmagiri in the upper and lower Deccan, Ahar in the Rajputana and Rangpur, etc. in Saurashtra It appears that Saurashtra, Rajasthan, Malwa and the Deccan were definitely in contact with each other at a certain period in their life. We may recognise the vague Harappan influences in certain form in them.[34] This peninsular chalcolithic complex has been located along with the Harappan and the Painted Grey-Ware sites in the Sarasvati region of the Ganganagar District of Rajasthan which projects itself as the proto-historic trijunction which appears to be some sort of rendezvous with various elements apparently converging but in fact diverging from it.[35] This is the meeting place of the East, the West and the South. It appears that this region, the heart of Brahmāvarta, was the prime capital of the foreign intruders from where three routes diverged to the east to the Ganjetic basin, to the south to the Deccan and to the west to Indus. The annihilated Harappans had their kith and kin in all these, three regions When the Brahmāryans settled in this region in the beginning of the first millennium B. C., they were surrounded by their adversaries in the east and the south.

The people of the south had enjoyed continued chalcolithic culture till at least 500 B C. when they were violently subjeted by the iron-using megalithic people. The introduction of iron, hence, assumes great significance here in the beginning of the first millennium B. C. The Harappans and

32. H. D. Sankalia; Report on The Excavations at Nasik and Jorwe 1950-1951; 1955, page 29.

33. H. D. Sankalia; The Excavations at Maheswar and Navdatoli 1952-1953; 1958; page 21.

34. H. D. Sankalia, op. cit. (M. & N.); page 247-249.

35. B. Subbarao; The Personality of India; 1958; page 111 Fig. 31 facing page 113.

the invading Āryans did not know the use of iron. The Dāśarājña War was fought without iron weapons of war. Iron reached the borders of Pakistan by circa 1000 B. C. and it reached central India by the middle of the first millennium B. C. None of the megalithic remains can be reasonably dated prior to 500 B. C. [36] It appears that the iron-using megalithic people reached the Deccan at the earliest by 500 B. C. Now the greatest riddle of the present problem faces us. If the Harappans and their kinsmen, the southern chalcolithic people are of the Mediterranean or Dravidian ethnic stock, who, then, are these iron-using new imposters ? Are they non Mediterraneans or the another wave of Mediterraneans ? If they are non-Mediterraneans, who, then, are they ? The chalcolithic culture is so distinct from the Megalithic culture that both the people cannot belong to one stock so as to regard their contacts an internecine event. Nobody proposes them to be the Brahmāryans. The linguists agree that the Dravidian language superimposed itself on the Austric language. If the chalcolithic people were Dravidian-speaking, what language, then, did these megalithic people speak and did their language also super-impose itself on the chalcolithic people's Dravidian language ? The factum of the foreign intrusion of the iron-using megalithic people, itself, solves this Dravidian problem They, then, are the people different and distinct from the people of the north. The chalcolithic people, hence, could not be the Mediterranean or the Dravidian ethnic group. The imposters on their culture were the another wave of the Mediterraneans who later became the Draviḍas of the Bhāratīya history.

Archaeology affords us evidence of the Iranian contacts with the central India somewhere in the later part of the second millennium B. C. or the first part of the first millennium B. C. The north had welcomed a mass Mediterranean wave in the beginning of the third millennium B. C. but there is no evidence that this wave penetrated the south. The southern Austric ethnic stock, unlike its counterpart of the north,

---

36. B. Subbarao; op. cit; page 113–114, 121.

hence, remained, in this respect, pure from any Mediterranean mixture. These original, not aboriginal, Austric people of Bhārata populated the Deccan before the intrusion of the Mediterranean people. They are the Nāgas, Pre-historic Āndhras, Pulindas and Śabaras of the Aitareya fame and the Ahis of the Ṛgvedic fame. Māhiṣmatī, the modern Maheswar in central India was the seat of the Nāgas,[37] the successors of the Ahis; and the other chalcolithic people being their kinsmen; we may safely assign the pre-iron-using-megalithic chalcolithic people of the Deccan to the Ahi ethnic stock—the pre-Dravidian Austric people.

Delusion of the Linguists

The linguists, like the anthropologists, have tentatively accepted the existence of the Dravidian-speaking people in Sindh and the Punjab before the Āryan invasions. They have been deluded to this hypothesis; like the Bhāratīya philosophy deluded by Brahma-Māyā and the anthropology by Skull-Māyā; by the Vāk-Māyā of the existence of the Brahui language in Baluchistan in the vicinity of Sindh. Chatterji advances only this Brāhmī linguistic argument for his presumption of the habitation of the Dravidians along with Austric people in north Indian plains.[38] He later adds to this argument the further argument of the presence of a strong Dravidian element in the Āryan language from the Vedic downwards.[39] Burrow accepts the Brāhmī argument but concedes that the main influence of the Dravidian on the Indo-Āryan was concentrated at a particular period of history, namely, between the Late Vedic and the formation of the classical Sanskrit. The majority of these influences are post-Vedic.[40] The Dravidian of Chatterji knew the horse. Ghutra is a word formed from the oldest Dravidian speech of India.[41] The horse was first introduced in Bhārata by the Brahmāryan invaders.

37. H. D. Sankalia; op. cit (M. &. N.); page 5-6, 252.
38. S. K. Chatterji; op. cit. (N. A. I. A.); page 46-47.
39. S. K. Chatterji; op. cit. (R. M. P. C); page 155.
40. T. Burrow; The Sanskrit Language; 1954, page 38-.
41. S. K. Chatterji; op. cit. (N. A. I. A.); page 49.

The Harappan people did not know the horse. This Dravidian word Ghutra appears to be a loan from the Sanskrit speech-word Ghoḍā. The existence of the Brahmī language does not warrant the conclusion that its parent Dravidian language ruled over the whole north India from Sindh to Bengal before the Āryan invasions. The Brahmī language may, at best, be related to Dravidī which cannot be dated earlier than the fifth century B C. Its existence may as well be explained by the intrusion of the Mediterranean people in the southern fringes of Baluchistan and Sindh in the seventh or eighth centuries B. C. from where it travelled to the Deccan via coastal regions of Gujarata. This theory may also explain the post-Vedic Dravidian influences on the Indo-Āryan, as suggested by Burrow. The remarks of Professor Antoine Meillet that the basis of the Rgveda's literary speech was a western dialect in the Āryan-speaking tracts, assume significance in this context This basic dialect of the Vedic speech had only the sound-Indo-European r and l both featuring in it as r- as in Old Iranian (Old Persian and Avestan). The matter of r and l formed an important point in dialectical diversity in the Old Indo-Āryan speech. There was thus one dialect that of the west, which had no l, but only r. There was another, which seems to be represented by Classical Sanskrit and Pali in this matter, which had both r and l. And there was a third dialect of the Indo-Āryan which eliminated the r and possessed only l : this dialect was probably of the extreme east, and it was pushed on further into the interior of the country as far as eastern Uttarapradesh and Bihar Province of the present-day, before the second stage of Āryan expansion and Āryan linguistic development, and became the Aśokan Eastern Prākṛt (which is believed to be the older form of the Ardha-Māgadhī Prākṛt of the Jainas) and the later Māgadhī Prākṛt, both of which had no r but only l. [42] The dialecticl diversity referred to here refers to two distinct and probably antagonistic linguistic systems. This is not an internal phenomenon of the one language, the Old Indo-Āryan speech. The r and l denoted the dividing line of the two warring speech

42. S. K. Chatterji; op. cit. (N. A. I. A.); page 51.

families, the former representing the Brahmāryan language and the latter the language of their adversaries who spoke an unintelligible speech. The victorious Brahmāryans finally succumbed to the language of their adversaries and adopted their Vāk or language.[43] The Rgveda informs us that this speech was spoken by the Dāsas and the Dasyus, the Mṛdhravāchaḥ or the Vadhrivāchaḥ, the adversaries of the invading Brahmāryans. It was this Vāk, the Sindh-Punjab language or the proto-Brāhmī language, which was the parent language of the Aśokan Prākṛt language and the Drāviḍī language. When the Brahmāryans came into Bhārata, they, undoubtedly, brought with them a number of hymns and other poetry. The tradition continued in Bhārata and when non-Āryan speakers joined the Āryan fold; it may be supposed that their poets also essayed hymns in this ready made literary speech. They also learnt the art of writing from their non-Āryan compatriots, or that the people of mixed Āryan and non-Āryan origin adopted the non-Āryan system of writing obtaining in India from the beginning to the Āryan (Brahmāryan) language. [44] This parental language and script, the proto-Prākṛt and the proto-Brāhmī, is the mother of all the languages and scripts of later India. Its culture-contacts with the Dravidian languages have left some marks on the latter but it has its distinct and independant personality. The Dravidians, like the Brahmāryans, adopted for their literary use the proto-Brāhmī script in the beginning. Their distinct Drāviḍī script separated from the mother script in the fifth century B. C. as noted earlier.

It has been emphasised that numerous words in the Ṛgveda are not connected with any known Indo-European roots and were evidently borrowed from the natives, [45] the original masters of Bhārata. The Dravidians, like the Āryans, had imposed their language on Bhārata. The plains of the Punjab and the valley of the Ganges which are pre-eminently the lands

43. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa; 3. 2. 1. 23–24.

44. S. K. Chatterji; op. cit. (N. A. I. A.) Pages 52, 46.

45. A. L. Basham; The Wonder that was India; 1957; page 28.

of Sanskṛt had been occupied by the non-Dravidian languages before the Indo-European (Brahmāryan) invasion. The pre-Dravidian Muṇḍā or Austric language could provide the sabstratum to such Ṛgvedic or Āryan speech as it did to the Dravidian speech [46] The Vedic language has not been examined from this point of view. If the influence of the Austric language on the Vedic language is chronologically studied from this aspect, it may reveal more possibilities than we can even possibly dream today.

Megalithicians = Dravidians

It has been suggested that the megalithic culture moved from north to south. Megalithic culture has been reported from Baluchistan, Pakistan, Rajputana, Uttarapradesh, Bihar, Kashmir and Nagpur The archaeological evidence suggests their southward movement and their longer survival in Gneissic areas of south India. The question of its movement straight to south India by sea is not supported by our present knowledge since none of the megalithic remains can reasonably be dated prior to 500 B. C. [47] These megalithic people appear to have moved towards north India from south India after the disintegration of the Aśokan empire after 200 B. C. [48] This period is also marked by the historic contacts of the Āryans of the north with the Dravidians of the south.

This survey points us to certain tentative canclusions. The megalithic Mediterranean people came by sea upto the ports of Baluchistan by circa 800 B. C. They moved eastwards along the southern borders of the Indus Valley to Gujarat. There they might have come in contact with the Jhukar people, the Bhṛgus of the Indian tradition. Some of them might have migrated also to the north but the bulk, sensing the powerful hegemony of the new masters of the land, preferred rather more peaceful and attractive southern route. No part of these immigrants advanced towards the Gangetic

46 Jules Bloch; op. cit; page 49, 36, 58, 59.

47. B Subbarao; op. cit. pages 120–121.

48. R. E. M. Wheeler, op. cit. (Ancient India no. 4); page 202.

basin. They might have come in contact with the proto-Prākṛt language and the proto-Brāhmī script in the Indus Valley region. This was the region still predominantly occupied by the pre-Brahmāryan original people of the land, the Austrics and their Brahmāryan compatriots in minority. They might have made the Narmadā region their base for further political consolidation. These megalithic Mediterraneans are the Dravidians of later Bhāratīya history who firmly implanted themselves on the Bhāratīya soil by circa 500 B. C.

Military conquest of the Deccan

The problem that now faces us is whether these Dravidians peacefully penetrated the region or did they make themselves the masters of the region by violent occupation ? The latter, is my answer Paraśurāma was the hero of this Dravidian military conquest of southern Bhārata.

Paraśu and Paraśurāma

The Rgveda, the post-Ṛgvedic Samhitās, and the Brāhmana literature knows Paraśu, in the sense of hatchet, axe and battle-axe; [49] but not the wielder of the axe, the Paraśurāma. Pānini knows Parśu as a weapon and Pārśavah as a class of Paraśu-wielders, the warrior-class (Āyudhajīvi Saṁgha) and Pārśavaḥ as an individual weapon-wielder. [50] Pānini also does not know Paraśurāma in the fourth century B. C. Patañjali in 150 B. C. does not know Paraśu nor Paraśurāma nor Bhārgava Paraśurāma though he knows the Bhṛgu caste. [51] Paraśurāma remains completely unknown to the

49. (1) Ṛgveda 1. 19. 1. 3; 6 1 3. 4; 7. 6 15. 21; 9. 3. 7. 30; 3. 4. 15 22; 4. 1. 6. 8; 1. 19. 4. 4.
(2) Atharvaveda; 3. 19. 4; 7. 28. 1; 20. 17. 9; 8. 4. 2.
(3) Taittirīya Saṁhitā 3. 2. 4. 1
(4) Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 2. 35.
(5) Chhāndogya Upaniṣad 6. 16. 1; 6. 16. 2.

50. (1) Pāṇini 5. 3. 117.
(2) S. C Vasu; The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pānini; 1962; Vol. II. 980–981.

51. B. N. Puri; India in the time of Patañjali; 1957; page 109.

Brahmarṣis till the redaction of Mahābhārata where he surprisingly enough springs into prominence, without any historical foundation whatsoever.

We may put these biographical bits of Paraśurāma in order for the purpose of our present enquiry. He was son of Bhārgava Jamadagni from his wife Reṇukā, daughter of Prasenjit, the Aikṣvāka king of Ayodhyā. The principal military conquest of Paraśurāma was achieved against a noble, righteous brave king Kārtavīrya, king of Anūpadeśa. (Malwa), of the Yādava Haihaya tribe. Then he went to Śūrpāraka, capital of Aparānta country and the South sea. He annihilated Kṣatriyas twentyone times. He performed an Aśvamedha for the atonement of his sins of violence and donated all his land and wealth but still could not completely become sinless. He then undertook severe austerities and attained the final aim. The result of his activities was to strengthen the Dravidians of the South. [52]

The Vedic literature knows Jamadagni as a Bhārgava-Aurva priest. [53] The descendants of Jamadagni, the Jāmadagnis are also known. [54] Paraśurāma has no relation,

52 A. D Pusalkar, Traditional History from the Earliest Time to the Accession of Parikṣita (In Vedic Age), 1957; pages 280–283.

53. (1) Ṛgveda 3. 5. 9 18, 8 10. 8. 8. 9. 3. 2 24, 9 3 5. 25; 9. 6. 1. 51, 3. 4. 15. 15; 3. 4. 15. 16; 7. 6. 7. 3; 8. 10. 9. 4.

(2) Atharvaveda 1. 8. 3, 15. 16; 2. 32. 3, 4. 29 3; 6. 137. 1.

(3) Taittirīya Saṁhitā 7. 2. 12. 4; 5. 2. 10. 5; 4. 3. 2. 2; 3. 1. 7. 3; 5. 4. 11. 3, 3 3. 5. 2; 7. 1. 8 1; 8. 10 9. 4.

(4) Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 2. 2. 4.

(5) Aitareya Brāhmana 7. 16; 4 26; 6. 33.

54. (1) Śukla Yajurveda; 3. 62; 13 56.

(2) Taittirīya Saṁhitā; 7. 1. 9. 1.

(3) Pañchaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa 21. 105. 6–7; 13. 5. 15; 22. 7. 2; 9. 4. 14; 13. 5. 15.

(4) Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 2. 2. 4.

whatsoever, of blood or otherwise with the Bhṛgus, the Auravas, Jamadagni or Jāmadagnis. Jamadagni may be placed prior to 1000 B. C. His descendants continued his line upto 600 B. C. but Paraśurāma does not figure anywhere. Jamadagni's wife Renukā was the daughter of the Ikṣvāku king of Ayodhyā, Prasenjit who flourished in the sixth century B. C.[55] Jamadagni could not possibly live for more than five hundred years to marry any daughter of Prasenajit or any other prince of the sixth century B. C. Renukā, hence, was neither the wife of Jamadagni nor the mother of any Paraśurāma. The alleged parentage of Paraśurāma does not stand historical tests.

History of Dravidian conquest of the Deccan

The summum bonum of the life of Paraśurāma is his alleged famous battle with Haihaya king Sahasrabāhu Arjuna, son of Kṛtavīra of Anūpadeśa. Arjuna is a great and virtuous Ksatriya warrior prince. He attacked Lankā, shot 500 arrows which bewildered it and made Rāvaṇa, the lord of Lankā, his captive. He conquered the Karkoṭaka-Sabhā in the city of Māhiṣmatī (together with) the thousand Nāgas Along with bow and arrow, Khaḍga (sword) was also his weapon. He was a great king, a Rājarsi,[56] following righteous path.[56] Vāyu-Purāṇa knows Paraśu[57] and Paraśurāma.[58] He is an expert in archery and a great annihilator of Kṣatriyas. But Vāyu-Purāṇa does not depict him as a conqueror of Arjuna. His annihilation of the whole Ksatriya order twentyone times has also not been narrated here and also in the Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa[59] which is so powerful a theme in the Mahābhārata, a favourite slogan with the bards of the great epic.[60] This

55 H. C Roychowdhari; op cit. (P H. A. I.); page 102

56. D. R Patil; Cultural History from the Vāyu-Purāṇa; 1946; pages 10, 22, 48, 52, 105

57. Vāyu-Purāṇa 30. 124.

58. Vāyu Purāṇa 91. 91.

59. D R Patil; op. cit. page 137.

60. V. S. Sukathankar; Epic Studies (VI); A. B. O. R. I. Vol. 18. page 6.

omission raises a great doubt in the historicity of battle between these two warring groups but a majority of the Purāṇas do give this story of great battle, hence we can not dismiss it as a mere fiction. It must have had some historical nucleus though not exactly the same as given by the Purānas and the Mahābhārata.

The iron-using megalithic people were war-like people who intruded Bhārata through Baluchistan. The remains of the megalithic people have been noted in Shah Billawal in Baluchistan and also in the hills on the direct road from Karachi to Kotri. They are generally known as Kaffir's graves. Megaliths have also been noted at Deosa in Jaipur district of Rajasthan, Deodhoora in Almora district of Uttara-pradesh. Leh in valley of Ladakh, Delhi, Mirzapur and Orissa.[61] The Baluchistan and Pakistan megaliths lie on the route of these intruders. The other north Indian megaliths are only later stray instances of late contacts. The megalithic culture is most conspicuous in south India in the provinces of Mysore, Madras and Travancore-Cochin. These megalithic people subjugated the original inhabitants by military conquest. They used weapons of war made of iron. The megalithic culture that displaced the chalcolithic culture is distinguished from the latter by the possession of the iron weapons. Iron daggers and axes have been excavated at Brahmagiri and Chandragiri,[62] Chingleput [63] and Maski. [64] Maheswar has yielded iron weapons of war used by the people who displaced the chalcolithic people. Object M 734 on figure 112, may well be the remnant of an iron axe. [65] shafe-hole axe though of copper and of iron, has been excavated at Jhukar.[66]

61. R. E. M. Wheeler; op. cit (A. I. no. 4); page 302–303.

62. R. E M. Wheeler; op cit (A. I. no. 4); page 254–283.

63. N. R. Banerji; The Megalithic Problem of Chingleput in the Light of Recent Exploration; Ancient India no. 12: p. 26.

64. B. K. Thapar; Maski 1954; A chalcolithic site of the southern Deccan Ancient India no. 1?; page 115–119.

65. H. D. Sankalia; op. cit. (E. M. N.); page 211–215.

66. Stuart Piggot; op. cit. (P. H. I.); page 227.

The presence of war-weap on and of Axe from Sindh to Cochin in the middle of the first millennium B. C. is of great historical significance.

Arjuna Kārtavīrya, the Sahasrabāhu, the renowned Yādava (Haihaya) hero, the leader of the Kṣatriya adversaries of Paraśurāma Bhārgava, ruled at Māhismatī, the capital city of Anūpadeśa, when his encounters with Paraśurāma began. The history of Māhiṣmatī is shrouded in great secrecy. The Purānas know only two masters of Avantī before its occupation by the Haihaya Yadu power. Forty-eight sons of Ikṣvāku ruled Daksināpātha. Among them his tenth son Dāśāśva reigned at Māhismatī on the river Narmadā. [67] Then we know its Nāga rulers who were annihilated by Arjuna Kārtavīrya. He conquered Māhiṣmatī from the Karkoṭaka Nāgas.[68] The Purāṇas abound in the various narrations of the glorious rule of the Haihayas over Māhismatī, and chiefly by Arjuna.[69] The country of Anūpa was situated on the river Narmadā in the vicinity of the country of Avantī. [70] The Buddhist literature of middle first millennium B. C. mentions two capitals of Avantī, Ujjayinī and Māhismatī. Ujjayinī was ruled over by king Chaṇḍa Pradyota of Avantī and Māhismatī by king Vessabhū. D. R. Bhandarkar accounts for this discrepancy by the assumption that the country of the Avantis was divided into two kingdoms, one placed in the Dakṣiṇāpatha having Māhismatī for its capital and the other, i. e. the northern kingdom, having its capital at Ujjayini. The north and south Avanti was divided by the river Vetravatī. [71] The Mahābhārata distinguishes between Avantī and Māhiṣmatī. [72] It appears that the Māhiṣmatī region was not included in the

67. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit. (A. I. H. T.); page 257.

68 Vāyu-Purāṇa; 24-28.

69. F. E. Pargiter; op. cit. (A. I. H. T.); page 153, 155, 242 262-263, 266, 280, 288.

70 D C. Sircar; Studies in the Geography of Ancient and Medieval India; 1960; page 35 Note 4, 214-215.

71. B. C. Law, North India in the Sixth century B. C. (in The Age of Imperial Unity); 1951; page 13.

72. B. C. Law; Tribes in Ancient India; 1943; page 387.

Avanti country. It was also not included in the sixteen Mahājanapadas of north India known to the Jaina and the Buddhist literature. The Māhiṣmatī region was included, then, in the Deccan and the Purānic bards coined the word Anūpa for its country which we do not come across in the more trust-worthy Jaina or Buddhist literature.

The Yadus had been annihilated in the Dāśarājña War. They had witnessed the efficacy of horse in war which was an important part of the Brahmāryan military machine. Some of them might have adopted the horse for military purposes and they came to be known as Horse-riding or Haihaya Yadus. Some of them might have migrated to the south after meeting their misfortune in the north and established themselves in the Narmadā region. The megalithic Mediterranean people might have come in contact during their advance with the Jhukar people, known to Vedic literature as the Bhṛgus.[73] These Bhrgus[74] were very popular with the indigenous races of Bhārata and had established their hegemony upto the regions of Bhṛgukachchha. The megalithic mediterraneans appear to have forged some sort of alliance with the Bhṛgus which facilitated their easy advance upto the Narmadā regions. To the east of Bhṛgukachchha region, lay the minghty kingdom of Avantī of Chaṇḍa Pradyota who had his alliances and engagements with the kingdoms of Kośala, Vatsa and Magadha. They might have also forged an alliance with their mighty Avantī neighbour thus associating themselves with the Kośalans. We may reasonably assume that one of the best of these people might have won a princess in matrimonial alliance from an insignificant Kośalan prince Prasenjit who gave birth to the most important military hero. The Pradyotas of Avantī were engaged in their struggles with the Magadhans and the Vatsas. They had no eye on the Deccan. This political

73 R. C. Jain, The Bhṛgus (Supra).

74. A. D. Karmarkar, Dr. V. S. Sukathankar's Theory of the Bhṛgulsation of the Original Bhārata and the Light it Throws on the Dravidian Problem; A. B. O. R. I; Vol. XX page 28.

situation afforded golden opportunity to these megalithic people to violently force their way in the Deccan. Māhiṣmatī held the key to Deccan, otherwise unconnected and unconcerned with the north. Hence the main brunt of the megalithic violence fell on Māhiṣmatī. It was burnt but it did not yield It was burnt the second time but it still held steadfast. It was burnt the third time. Three conflagrations have been noticed at Māhiṣmatī.[75] These repeated military onslaughts annihilated the Māhiṣmatī power. The key was won and the gates to the Deccan opened

The megalithic army, then, under the military commandership of Paraśurāma advanced southwards and made Sūrpāraka, their military base. Sūrpāraka is modern Supara in Thana District of Bombay. It was the capital of Aparānta.[76] His military onslaughts then covered the whole south He carried on his military invasions to various strategic vantage points of Āndhra, Karnataka, Tamil-deśa and Kerala. Brahmagiri, Chandragiri, Chingleput, Sangankallu, Piklihal, Sanur, Porkalam, Adichchanallur, Puddukotai, Cochin and other megalithic sites of the iron-weaponed megalithic invaders are only a few representative witnesses out of the hundreds of the vanquished chalcolithic towns and cities The megalithic conquest went right upto Kanyākumārī in the farthest south where the purpose of the supreme axe achieved fulfilment, Paraśurāma threw away his Paraśu at Kanyākumārī. Then the supreme spiritual knowledge dawned upon him. The light of wisdom was imported to him by the Nagnikā or Nagnā or Nāga virgins.[77] He forsook the cult of violence, accepted the cult of non-violence, and took to severe austerities at Mahendra Parvata, the modern Eastern Ghats mountains.[78] That climax gave relief to a great materialistic

75. R. Subbarao; op. cit. page 107.

76. B. C. Law; Historical Geography of Ancient India; 1954; page 299.

77. Mahābhārata (Gita Press; Southern Recension Version); 1955; page 793.

78. (1) Mahābhārata (Cr. Ed.) 1. 58. 4.
(2) D. C. Sircar; op. cit. page 54.

violent career. That is the permanent influence, continuing since eternity on everything gross and material. This is what the historians know as the unbroken continuity of the Bhāratīya culture. The physically vanquished culture celebrates its spiritual triumph.

Dravidāvarta

The Deccan history proper opens circa 230 B. C. with the establishment of the Sātavāhana power.[79] The megalithic invaders had consolidated their conquests by then. The chalcolithic culture survives at least till circa 500 B C. and the megalithic culture can not be pushed at the present state of our knowledge beyond 400 B. C. It is safe to assume that the Megalithic foreign invaders won and consolidated their military conquest between 500–225 B. C. The history repeats itself. After the Brahmāryan victory in the north circa 1100 B C. in the Dāśarājña War, Trasadasyu, the Pūru, became supreme power. After the Megalithic or Dravidian victory in the south circa 500 B. C. and after the receding of the chaos and turmoil wrought by extensive battles; the Āndhra or Āndhrabhṛtya Sātavāhanas assumed supreme power. The victors and the vanquished coalesced together and gave birth to a new culture and civilization in the south. The Deccan becomes the Megalith-āvarta or the Dravidāvarta.

The conquest of the Deccan by the Dravidians, after the conquest of western Bhārata by the Brahmāryans, within less than a millennium, is the greatest event of history of ancient Bhārata. The Ṛgveda is the epic of the destruction of one of the great culture of the ancient world,[80] the Harappa or the Indus Valley or the Bhāratīya culture and civilization. Where are we to look for the great epic of destruction of that great culture in the Deccan? Is there any literary monument to this Dravidian violence and destruction?

---

79. K. A. Nilkantha Shastri; A History of South India; 1958; page 88.

80. Jacquetta Hawkes and Leonard Woolley; Pre-History and the Beginnings of Civilization; 1963; page 389.

The Deccan knows two heroes: Paraśurāma and Agastya. Agastya is of the Ṛgvedic fame. He is the real brother of Vasiṣṭha. Agastya occurs in the Vedic and the Brāhmaṇa literature as a priest, also as the husband of Lopāmudrā. He does not at all occur in the principal Upaniṣads. Agastya and Lopāmudrā become associated with the Deccan in the Mahābhāratic age between circa 200 B C.—200 A. D. He is made the father of Tamil language in the ninth century A. D. This false assertion of the derivation of the entire culture of the Tamil country as derived from a Vedic seer met with counter-assertion and opposition.[81] The superficial case of Agastya may be dismissed in limine.

The case of Paraśurāma stands on a stronger footing Paraśurāma's mother Reṇukā is worshipped as the Dravidian deity Ellanimā[82] Several places in the Deccan are associated with the name of Paraśurāma.[83] Almost all the exploits of Paraśurāma are associated with the Deccan. His famous weapon, the axe, has only been excavated in the Deccan. It has not at all been discovered in the Saraswatī region with which the legends associate him. The accumulated burden of all the available evidence make Paraśurāma the greatest hero of the Deccan. His deeds are great. This great event of Bhāratīya history could not and has not gone unrecorded. Megalithism or Dravidianism has also got its epic of destruction of the great Bhāratīya civilization and culture.

Dravidiisation of Bhārata

The Ṛgveda records the Brahmāryan wars and battles with their adversaries, the Bhāratīya people. The bards and rhapsodists topsy-turvied the events and names of the original combatants and transmitted the Jaya epic with transmissions and transpositions. The continuous and growing coalescences of the victors with the vanquished people changed the character of these events and personalities time and again. The

81. K. A. N. Shastri; op. cit., page 72, 75.

82. A. P. Karmarkar, op. cit., A. B. O. R. I., Vol. XX page 24.

83. V. S. Sukathankar; op. cit., A. B. O. R. I., Vol. XVIII. page 2.

Jaya epic completely transformed itself in the Bhārata epic. Bhārata epic of Vaiśampāyana included in itself only the events and characters pertaining only to north India. This character of the Bhārata epic continued till circa 200 B. C. When the coalesced Brāhmaṇa society āryanised the Deccan, the whole picture of the society further changed. There were fnrther coalescences and amalgamations. There were mutual fusions of legends, traditions, myths and ideas. This dialectical development stirred fresh literary activities. The limited north Indian Bhārata epic had to be made broad-based and all-inclusive. Deccan was asserting itself and the circumstances forced the due recognition of the entire revision of the epic. The literary activity in this age had become monopolised in the hands of the Bhṛgu poets who maintained their supremacy amongst the Brāhmaṇas and also wanted to be liberal and responsive to the original people. They had also earlier assimilated the Śramaṇic culture of the land. This gave them great power from both sides. They made the great Dravidian hero Paraśurāma, the best of the Bhṛgus. He along with Varṇa, gotra and caste also needed a parentage. The Bhṛgu rhapsodists brought down the Ṛgvedic Jamadagni to sixth century B. C., wedded him Reṇukā, daughter of Prasenjit, king of Kośala, at his capital-city Ayodhyā and attached their parentage to Paraśurāma. These Bhṛgu bards have sung the Bhṛguised Paraśurāma's twentyone annihilative battles with the Kṣatriyas, times without number in the Mahābhārata. They could have as well sung fotry-two or more annihilitative battles because that was a historical truth. The iron-axe-using Dravidians had given more than twenty-one battles to the Austric people of the Deccan. These Austric people are none else than the Ahis or the Dāsa-Dasyus of the Ṛgveda and the Nāgas of later history who could finally be annihilated only in the Gupta age in the fifth century A. D. The Mahābhārata represents the story of the Āryo-Dravidian militarism. We may call it the Bhṛguisation of the Bhārata epic. But we would be nearer truth if we call it the Dra-viḍāiśation of the Bhārata epic. The Āryan and the Dravidian militarists completed the annihilation of the spiritual Austric

people of Bhārata. The Mahābhārata is the great epic of destruction of the great culture and civilization of Bhārata from Afghanistan, Baluchistan to Bengal and from Himālaya to Kanyākumārī. The Austric people are the true Indians to whom the Āryans[84] and the Dravidians owe an explanation at the bar of history for the destruction of their great spiritual culture and civilization.

84. J. Hawks and L. Woolley; op. cit., page 389, 406.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. ORIGINAL TEXTS.

1 Aitareya Āraṇyaka.
2 Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.
3 Amarkośa.
4 Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra.
5 Aṣṭādhyāyī.
6 Atharvaveda Pariśiṣṭa.
7 Atharvaveda Saṁhitā.
8 Baudhāyana Dharma Sūtra.
9 Bhāgavata Purāna.
10 Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad.
11 Chhāndogya Upaniṣad.
12 Gopatha Brāhmaṇa.
13 Jātaka.
14 Kauṣitakī Brāhmaṇa.
15 Kauṣitakī Upaniṣad.
16 Mahābhārata (cr. ed.)
17 Mahābhārata (Gita Press)
18 Mahāparinibbāṇa Sutta.
19 Majjhima Nikāya.
20 Manusmṛti.
21 Nirukta.
22 Pañchaviṁsa Brāhmaṇa.
23 Ṛgveda Saṁhitā.
24 Ṛgveda Saṁhitā (Sāyaṇa Bhaṣya)
25 Saḍviṁśa Brāhmaṇa.
26 Śāṅkhyāyana Śrauta Sūtra.
27 Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa.
28 Śukla Yajurveda.
29 Tattirīya Brāhmaṇa.
30 Tattirīya Saṁhitā.
31 Uttarādhyayana Sūtra.
32 Uvāsagadasao Sūtra.

33 Vasiṣṭha Dharma Sūtra.
34 Vāyu-Purāṇa.
35 Vedānta Sūtra.
36 Viṣṇu Purāṇa.

II. REFERENCES WORKS.

1 Agrawal, V. S.; India as known to Pāṇini, 1252; University of Lucknow, Lucknow.
2 Ambedkar, B. R.; The Untouchables; 1948; Amrit Book Co., New Delhi.
3 Ambedkar, B. R ; Who are the Shudras ?; 1947; Thaker & Co. Ltd., Bombay.
4 Banerji-Shastri, A–; Asura India; 1926; Patna.
5 Basham, A. L.; The wonder that was India; London.
6 Bhandarkar, R. G.; Early History of the Deccan; 1957; Shushil Gupta (India) Ltd., Calcutta.
7 Bloomfield, M; The Atharvaveda; 1899; Varlage Von Karl J. Trubner. Strassburg.
8 Bloomfield. M; The Life and stories of Jaina Saviour Pārśvanātha; 1919; Johns Hopkins Press Baltimore.
9 Bollee, W. B.; Saḍviṁsa Brāhmaṇa; Gobren Te Haarlem.
10 Brough-John; The Early Brāhmaṇical Gotra and Pravāra; 1953; Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
11 Buhlar, G.; The Laws of Manu, 1886; S. B. E. Series; Vol. XXV; Claredon Press, Oxford.
12 Burrow, T.; The Sanskrit Language; 1954; London.
13 Calland, W.; Pañchaviṁsa Brāhmaṇa; 1931; Asiatic society of Bengal, Calcutta.
14 Chatterji, S.K.; Indo-Āryan and Hindi; 1960 Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyaya, Calcutta.
15 Chawdhari, S. B.; Ethnic Settlements in Ancient India; 1955; General Printers and Publishers, Calcutta.
16 Childe, V. Gordon; New Light on the Most Ancient East; 1958; Routledge and Kagan Paul, London.
17 Das, A. C.; Ṛgvedic Culture; 1925; R. Cambray & Co., Calcutta.
18 Davids, Rhys; Buddhist India; 1959; Shushil Gupta (India) Ltd., Calcutta.

19 Eggling, J.; Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa Five Volumes; 1963; Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi.
20 Filliozat, I; Political History of India; 1957; Shushil Gupta (India) Ltd., Calcutta.
21 Gokhale, B. G.; Ancient India; 1959; Asia Publishing House, Bombay.
22 Gordon, D. H.; The Pre-historic Background of Indian culture, 1958; Bhulabhai Memorial Institute, Bombay.
23 Griffith, Relph T. H.; The Hymns of the Atharvaveda; 1916; E. J. Lazarns & Co., Benares.
24 Griffith, Relph T. H.; The Texts of the White-Yajurveda; 1957, E. J. Lazarns & Co., Benaras.
25 Hawkes, Jacquetta and Leonard Woolley, Pre-history and the beginnings of the civilization; 1963; George Allen & Unwin Ltd, London.
26 Heras, H. ; Studies in Proto-Indo-Mediterranean culture; 1953; Indian Historical Research Institute, Bombay.
27 Herzfeld, Ernest E; Iran in the Ancient East; 1941; Oxford University Press, Oxford.
28 Jacobi, Hermann; Jaina Sūtras Vol. 22 and 45; S. B. E. Series; Clarendon Press, Oxford.
29 Jain, R. C. ; The Most Ancient Āryan society ; 1964; The Institute of Bhāratalogical Research, Ganganagar.
30 Jayaswal, K. P ; Hindu Polity; 1955; Bangalore Printing & Publishing Co. Ltd, Bangalore.
31 Johnson, Helen m. ; Triśaṣṭiśalākā – Puruṣa – Charita Vols. I, II; M. S. University of Baroda, Baroda.
32 Kaushalayana, B. A. ; Jātaka; 1951; Sahitya Sammelan, Allahabad.
33 Keith, A. B.; The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and the Upaniṣads 1925; Harward University Press, Massachusetts.
34 Khabardar, A. F.; New Light on the Gathas of Holy Zarthusthra; 1951; Author; Bombay.
35 Krishna Iyer, L. A. and K. K. Balaratnam; Anthropology of India; 1961; Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay.
36 Law, B. C.; Historical Geography of Ancient India, 1954; Societie Asiatique de Paris, France.

37 Law, B. C.; Magadhas in Ancient India; 1946; Royal Asiatic Society, London.
38 Law, B. C.; Mahāvīra; 1937; Luzav & Co, London.
39 Law, B. C.; Tribes in Ancinet India; 1943; Bhandarkar Oriantal Research Institute, Poona.
40 Levi, Sylvain; Pre-Āryan and Pre-Dravidian in India; 1929 Calcutta University Press, Calcutta.
41 Maccrindle, I. W; Ancient India as described by Magasthemes and Arrian; 1960; B. D. Chakravarty, Calcutta.
42 Macdonell, A. A.; A History of Sanskrit Literature, 1958 Munshilal Manohorlal, Delhi.
43 Macdonell & Keith ; Vedic Index Vol I & II, 1958; Motilal Banarsidas Delhi.
44 Majumdar, R. C. & Others. An Advanced History of India 1958; Macmillan & Co. Ltd, London.
45 Majumdar, R. C. and A. D. Pusalkar; Vedic Age; 1957; Bhāratīya Vidya Bhavan; Bombay.
46 Majumdar, R. C.; The Age of Imperial Unity; 1953; Bhāratīya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay.
47 Majumdar, R. C. and A. L. Pusalkar; The Age of Imperial Kananj; 1955 ; Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan Bombay.
48 Majumdar R. C. & others; The struggle for Empire; 1957; Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay.
49 Majumdar R. C. & others; The Delhi Sultanate; 1669; Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay.
50 Majumdar R. C. & others; An Advanced History of India; 1958; Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay.
51 Maxmuller, F; The Vedas; 1958; Shushil Gupta (India) Ltd, Calcutta.
52 Mehta, Ratilal N; Prebuddhist India; 1939; Bombay.
53 Misra, Yogendra; An Early History of Vaiśālī; 1962; Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.
54 Monier-Williams ; Sanskrit-English Dictionary; 1956; Oxford University Press, Oxford.
55 Moscati; Sabatino; The Face of the Ancient Orient; 1960; Routlege & Kagan Paul, London.

56 Mukherji, Radhakumud; Ancient India; 1956; Indian Press (Publication) Private Limited, Allahabad.
57 Nilkantha, Shastri K. A. A. History of South India ; 1958; Oxford University Press, Oxford,
58 Pande. G. C. ; Studies in the Origins of Buddhism; 11957; University of Allahabad, Allanabad.
59 Pande, R B.; Indian Palaeography; 1957; Motilal Banarsi das, Delhi.
60 Pargiter; F. E. ; Ancient Indian Historical Tradition; 1962; Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi.
61 Pargiter, F. E. ; The Purāna Texts of the Dynasties of the Kali Age; 1962; Chawkhamba Sanskrit Series, Benares.
62 Patil, D. R. ; Cultural History from the Vāyu Purāṇa ; 1946 ; Deccan College Postgraduate & Research Institute, Poona.
63 Piggot, Stuart, Pre-historic India ; 1950; Penguin Books.
64 Pradhan, Sitanath ; Chronology of Ancient India ; 1927, Calcutta University Press, Calcutta.
65 Pritchard, James B. ; Ancient Near Eastern Texts ; Relating to Old Testament; 1955; Princeton University Press, U. S. A.
66 Puri, B. N. ; India in the Time of Patañjali; 1957; Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay.
67 Pusalkar, A D. ; Śiśna-deva in the Ṛgveda and Phallus worship in the Indus Valley; 1954; Visvesvarnand Vedic Research Institute, Hoshiarpur.
68 Pusalkar; A. D. ; Studies in Epics and Purāṇas; 1955 ; Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay.
69 Radhakrishanan, A. S.; Principal Upaniṣads ; 1953 ; George Allen & Unwin Ltd, London.
70 Rapson, EJ; Cambridge History of India (Vol. I) (Ancient India) 1955; S. Chand & Co, Delhi.
71 Roychowdhari; H. C. Political History of Ancient India; 1950; University of Calcutta, Calcutta.
72 Roychowdhari; H. C. Studies in Indian Antiquities ; 1958; University of Calcutta, Calcutta.
73 Rydh, Hannah ; Rangmahal; 1959; C. W. K. Publishers Lund (Sweden).

74 Sankalia, J. D.; Excavation at Maheswar and Navaḍātoli; 1958 Deccan College Post-Graduate and Research Institute, Poona.

75 Sankalia, H. D. & others; Report on the Excavation at Nasik and Jorve; 1955; Deccan College & Post-Graduate & Research Institute, Poona.

76 Sankalia, J. D. others; The Excavations at Maheswar and Navaḍātoli; 1958; Deccan College Postgraduate & Research Institute, Poona.

77 Sankalia, H. D. ; & others; From History to Pre-history at Nevasa ; 1960; Deccan College Postgraduate & Research Institute Poona.

78 Sankalia, H. D. ; Studies in the Historical and culture Geography and Ethnography of Gujerat; 1949; Deccan College Postgraduate & Research Institute, Poona.

79 Sarup, Laxman; The Nighantu and the Nirukta, 1962; Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi.

80 Shaffer, R. ; Ethnography of Ancient India; 1954; Otto Harrassowitz, wiesbaden, Germany.

81 Sheth; H. G. Pai-Sadda-Mahannavo; 1928; Author, Calcutta.

82 Sircar, D. C. ; Studies in the Geography of Ancient and Meideval India; 1960; Motilal Banārsidas, Delhi.

83 Subbarao, Personality of India; 1958; M. S. University of Baroda, Baroda.

84 Sykes, Percy; A History of Persia; 1958; 2 Vols. Macmillan & Co. Ltd, London.

85 Thibaut; George; Vadanta Sūtras; 1962; S.B. E. (Series; Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi.

86 Varma, Siddheswar; The Etymologies of Yāska; 1953; V. V. Research Institute, Hoshiarpur.

87 Vasu, S. C. ; The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini; 1962; Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi.

88 Vijayendra Suri; Āchārya; Tirathaṁkar Mahāvīra; 1960 Yashodharma Mandir, Bombay.

89 Wadia, D. N.; Geology of India; 1958; Macmillan & Co. Ltd, London.

90 Weber, A.; The History of Indian Literature; 1961; Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, Benares.

91 Wheeler, Mortimer; The Indus civilization; 1953; University Press, Cambridge.

92 Whitney; W. D.; Atharvaveda-Saṁhitā; 1962; Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi.

93 Wilson, H. H.; Ṛgveda (Translation) Five Volumes; Ashtekar & Co, Poona.

94 Winternitz, M.; A History of Indian Literature; 1959; University of Calcutta, Calcutta.

95 Woolley, Leonard; A Forgotten Kingdom; 1953; Penguin Books.

96 Woolley, Leonard; Excavations at Ur; 1955; Ernest Benu Ltd, London.

97 Woolley, Leonard; History Unearthed; 1958; Ernest Benu Ltd, London.

III. JOURNALS

1 Ancient India Numbers 2, 3, 4, 9, 10–11, 12, 13.

2 Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute Vols. 12, 18, 20, 21, 30, 32, 36, 40, 41, 43.

3 Bhāratīya Vidyā Vol. 18.

4 Indian Studies : Past and Present Vol. I.

5 Jain Bharati Vol. 10, 11.

6 Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal Vols. LX (1891) 4(1908) 7(1911) 16(1920); 18(1922).

7 Journal of the Bombay Branch of Royal Asiatic Society Vol. 23, 26.

8 Journal of the Oriental Institute Vol. XI.

9 New Indian Antiquary Vol. 5, 6.

10 Proceedings and Transaction of the All India Oriental Conference sessions 1, 6.

11 Proceedings of Indian History Congress, sessions 22, 23.

12 Purāṇa Vol. 3.

GENERAL INDEX

THE ETHNOLOGICAL TERMS
HAVE NOT BEEN INDEXED

A

B

W

Y

Z

Printed by V. V. Press, Varanasi-1.